UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

PRINCE

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/10
15 October 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (d) of the provisional agenda*

# REVIEW OF THE GOVERNING STRUCTURES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

## Report of the Executive Director

## Introduction

1. UNEP has been assigned a pre-eminent role in identifying and assessing environmental issues of common concern, inducing their resolution through international cooperation and providing policy guidance for the direction and coordination of environmental programmes within the United Nations system.

2. The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) of 1992, the emergence of the new paradigm of sustainable development, the multiplicity of new actors and significant changes in the geopolitical structure are some of the critical elements which have substantially transformed the scope of the international environmental agenda.

3. If the world community is to respond effectively to critical threats to our environment, to manage complex interdependencies and to rise to the challenges of sustainable development, UNEP must fulfil its potential as the authoritative voice and catalyst for action on behalf of the environment.

4. The Governing Council at its eighteenth session recognized that UNEP must quickly adapt to these new circumstances. It approved a new integrated programme of work directly responding to Agenda 21 and building upon the organization's mandate and particular strengths. It encouraged the Executive Director to continue on the path of management reform, bringing the organization's structure into line with the approved programme of work, and putting in place processes that would ensure efficiency, effectiveness,

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0594 161096 171096

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

transparency and excellence. A third element of the strengthening of UNEP is the assurance of a sufficient and stable resource base. On each of these three elements - programme, management and financing - the Governing Council at its nineteenth session will receive a progress report.

5. Additionally, the Governing Council at its eighteenth session determined that Agenda 21's expression of the need for an enhanced and strengthened role for UNEP and its Governing Council required an improvement in the governance of the organization itself. It requested the Executive Director, after consultations with Governments, to propose to the Council at its nineteenth session options to modify and streamline the governing structures (decision 18/2 is attached as annex 1). The present paper responds specifically to that request, which is a testimony of the need for change.

## I. SCOPE AND PROCESS OF THE REVIEW

6. In response to the mandate contained in Governing Council decision 18/2, the Secretariat consulted widely. More than 90 countries responded, including more than 80 per cent of Governing Council members. The Secretariat also undertook an historical review of the development of UNEP's governance regime and a factual analysis of the governing structures of a number of relevant organizations. Annex 2 documents this process.

7. The focus of the review was institutional. The Governing Council decided to undertake the review "with a view to itself taking action or, where necessary, recommending to the General Assembly to take action". The present note, therefore, limits itself to a review of the bodies which constitute the UNEP system of governance, in accordance with their respective mandates, and which are within the decision-making power of the Governing Council or the General Assembly. These bodies are: the Governing Council itself, its Bureau, and subsidiary bodies of the Governing Council, including the Committee of Permanent Representatives. The review takes into account the existence of informal consultations of the Executive Director with selected Ministers and regional consultations at the Ministerial level, as both have a direct bearing on the governance of UNEP. Annex 3 summarizes the mandate, membership and modus operandi of these bodies.

8. To sustain and strengthen the quality, impact and output of an organization the following characteristics for an effective governance regime are identified:

(a) influence - policy choices that lead to action not paralysis; policy choices that influence those who take decisions; policy decisions that elicit compliance, that parties will not ignore; political momentum and strength, including high-level, ministerial involvement, to ensure that the organization's voice is heard in crucial debates;

(b) sense of "ownership" and legitimacy - critical constituencies which, through a system of democratic representation, have an informed voice, an input into decision-making and a commitment to the outcome;

(c) agility and responsiveness - ability to adapt rapidly to changing circumstances; ability to be anticipatory and proactive;

(d) shared values but distinct accountabilities - all elements of the system work toward common goals; distinction between roles understood;

(e) efficiency and transparency - effective oversight of implementation of the programme mandated by Governments, without detracting from the delegated authority of the executive head;

(f) assurance of financial resources - the organization is able to implement the policies and programmes approved in a predictable manner.

## II. OBSERVATIONS

9. That Governments desire an authoritative voice and catalyst for action on behalf of the environment is not in question. That thorough review of UNEP's governance regime is necessary is not in doubt. Opinions vary as to the nature of the structural and procedural modification required. On any detailed assessment of the present inadequacies consensus would be difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, measured against the characteristics of an effective governance regime, the following questions can be asked.

10. Is the organization perceived as having political vitality, profile and voice in crucial debates where decisions are taken? Although individual Ministers may make themselves heard, the strong collective voice of the governing body of the organization is all too often absent or fragmented. Is the Governing Council's influence felt, for example, in the forest policy debate, in the climate change negotiations, in setting the environmental agenda of the World Trade Organization (WTO), or in mobilizing resources at the Council? Does UNEP's Governing Council remain the central environmental policy forum with Ministers of Environment asserting primary responsibility? Does this forum support and influence Ministers in carrying out their national responsibilities? Is the degree of political influence on the strategic direction of the organization sustained and sufficient enough for it to achieve not only relevance, but credibility as an environmental agenda-setter? Does UNEP's Governing Council provide holistic strategic guidance to counter the fragmentation of the environmental debate resulting from the growing number of specialized environmental conventions and their autonomous governing bodies and secretariats? On any important global environmental issue, is UNEP's perspective conveyed in a timely and compelling manner?

11. The objectives of the organization and the decisions taken by UNEP's governing body are more likely to be acceptable and ultimately advanced if the governance regime is perceived to be democratically representative. Universal participation underpins the decision-making process of the United Nations and is not achieved fully in UNEP's current governing structures. The Governing Council is limited to 58 member States, although States not members may and do participate in sessions as observers. The membership of the Committee of Permanent Representatives currently does not correspond to Governing Council membership, with 25 per cent or 15 of 58 member States not being represented in Nairobi. Certain geographical regions such as the

Central Asian republics, West Africa, small island developing States and least-developed countries, are particularly disadvantaged.

12. As in the economic sphere, regional mechanisms are being established, providing the fora for the exchange of views and policy dialogue. UNEP's governance acknowledges and benefits from this trend only in informal and sporadic ways. There exists no comprehensive and formal relationship between these consultations and UNEP's work programme.

13. The potential contributions of non-governmental organizations, the private sector and civil society have not been sought systematically to strengthen the role of Governments in providing leadership and setting legislative frameworks for environmental actions.

14. If an organization is to be proactive rather than reactive in this complex, dynamic environment, it must be agile. The governing structure of UNEP, with its biennial meetings of the Governing Council, is constrained in providing timely and substantive policy guidance to the secretariat and in presenting a powerful collective voice in high-level forums which meet more frequently and at the Ministerial level, for example, the Commission on Sustainable Development. Informal consultations with a restricted number of Ministers of Environment, although useful in gaining insight on specific issues and developments of common concern, may lack transparency. They cannot be used as the only source of overall policy guidance and advice on the strategic direction of the organization and programme implementation.

15. Each element of the system needs to clearly understand its role in achieving the objectives of the organization and in relating to other elements. The technical functions of subsidiary bodies and expert groups should offer sound recommendations and advice as input into, and not as a substitute for, consideration and decision by the senior body. Equally, the Governing Council should avoid subsuming the detailed technical functions of subsidiary bodies. Lack of clarity about roles, poor communication and conflicting advice among these bodies currently result in inefficiencies and weaker decisions. At the eighteenth session of the Governing Council, decisions prepared by the subsidiary body did not command agreement from environmental experts and representatives attending the meeting, causing time-consuming renegotiations and insufficient attention to key strategic issues. The environmental agenda was not being set by experts with environmental knowledge.

16. The Committee of Permanent Representatives has served as an important channel of communication between Governments and UNEP. The relationship between UNEP and the Committee of Permanent Representatives, however, requires continuing attention to such factors as: a perception of too little and untimely information and briefings from the side of the secretariat; the tendency of several representatives to micro-manage UNEP; the lack of a fully representative corps diplomatique with sufficient environmental expertise in Nairobi; and the fact that the communication between the embassies in Nairobi and Ministers of Environment in capitals is in some instances weak to non-existent. The Committee of Permanent Representatives in its present setting therefore is not ideal as a sole partner of UNEP as far as two-way information, guidance and advice are concerned.

17. Efficiency and transparency need to be pursued if the collective human and financial effort is to be converted into results. An approved work programme inconsistent with an approved budget is dysfunctional. Lack of focus and discipline may result in too many decisions often of an administrative character with limited strategic guidance. Too many meetings, consuming too much time, demanding too much documentation are costly in terms of financial resources and lack of focus. Poor scheduling can result in a misuse of the valuable presence of Ministers by substituting Ministerial statements for participation in policy dialogue and debate.

18. The more influential and successful an organization, the larger its constituency and its ability to attract financial resources and the greater its assurance of adequate and predictable financing. In turn, to achieve such influence and success, financial security and enhanced political support are required. This is the vicious cycle in which UNEP currently finds itself.

19. The strengths and weaknesses of the present system of governance are in essence all related to the need for the UNEP secretariat and member States to provide each other with and receive adequate and timely information, guidance and advice on the implementation of the work programme as well as on emerging environmental issues, concerns and events. The institutional structures which have been established and developed to play a part in that process, in particular the intersessional ones, are, for various reasons, not optimal in complementing each other and providing full information, guidance and advice. This is partly due to the fact that views, and consequently practices, as to what constitutes a sufficiently effective and efficient system of governance differ.

## III. THE OPTIONS

20. There is no single desirable model or blueprint for reform that would meet all expectations, but there are actions which, taken together, would modify the governance regime and result in a strengthened organization. All are necessary, none alone is sufficient. Some actions could be implemented immediately, while others could be pursued over time. Lessons can be drawn from the experiences of other United Nations organizations, but they have limited value without an understanding of the purpose and culture of each organization. Two elements of reform are: the reform of working methods and the reform of structures.

### A. Reform of working methods

21. Efficiency, effectiveness and transparency can be enhanced quickly through simple means.

22. A recent analysis conducted by United Nations Headquarters reveals that the notional cost of a single page of documentation in the six official languages is US$ 916; the notional cost of one 3-hour meeting is US$ 4,500, and thousands of dollars are misused annually while interpreters wait for meetings to commence. Rough estimates for servicing meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives in Nairobi range from US$ 3,000 per subcommittee or technical briefing meeting to US$ 4,300 for quarterly

meetings of the entire Committee. This does not include staff costs to prepare specially requested reports. Twenty-four meetings have been held in 1996 to date.

23. The following suggestions are made:

(a) Bodies could review their needs with a view to rationalizing requests for conference services and ensure full use of interpretation time by having meetings convened punctually;

(b) Bodies could review recurrent documentation and eliminate what they deem unnecessary; some reports could be considered on a less frequent basis; agenda items could be merged and reports consolidated; bodies could make oral rather than written reports and exercise restraint in making proposals containing requests for any new reports;

(c) Bodies could reinforce the practice of secretariat reports normally consisting of no more than four pages.

24. Efforts to enhance transparency have begun by developing standard formats for reporting purposes; ensuring that budget and programme documents are clearly linked and that reports on implementation of Governing Council decisions and on programme implementation are cumulative and that all anticipated sources of funding are reflected in one composite financial report; and ensuring that the most appropriate senior official is present at meetings in accordance with the agenda of the meeting.

25. Effectiveness can be measured by the quality of the decisions made. A review of the decisions adopted by the Governing Council at its seventeenth and eighteenth sessions reveals that the number of decisions has increased. However, such an increase has not been matched by substantive guidance of a strategic nature. Other than the fundamental decisions adopting the integrated programme of work and budget for the biennium, only 8 of 49 decisions of the Governing Council at its eighteenth session could be characterized as giving substantive guidance (for example, in the areas of globalization, state of the environment reports, law, chemicals, biosafety and protecting the marine environment). A number of decisions that appear to be substantive are of a procedural character, such as calling for meetings, without giving clear guidance in terms of the objectives to be achieved. Others note the receipt of reports that have been requested and submitted automatically over the years. Still others isolate elements of the proposed programme of work causing undue emphasis to be given to that particular element rather than to the balanced programme as a whole, thus giving conflicting guidance to the secretariat. Policy decisions of the Governing Council concerning the direction of the organization internally and in its relationship with other parts of the United Nations system range from 5 of 44 at the seventeenth session to 8 of 49 at the eighteenth session. Furthermore, decisions have been taken without taking into account their financial implications.

26. Action has been taken to address many of these shortcomings in the preparation of documentation for the nineteenth session of the Council. The organization of work at Governing Council sessions is a continuing process of change. Greater discipline in preparing fewer, but more significant

decisions will be required. Greater coherence in decisions taken could be achieved through the proposal to have the in-session programme and budget committees meet as a single Committee of the Whole. Cooperation and coordination are of particular importance for the Governing Council at its nineteenth session, where, in addition to the programme budget for the 1998-1999 biennium, a mid-term review of 1996-1997 will take place. The Governing Council will also have to be alert to the implications of taking decisions without assessing financial implications.

27. For the past two Governing Council sessions, a high-level segment of relatively short duration has attracted a record number of 56 Ministers to the seventeenth session and 47 Ministers to the eighteenth session. A sharply focused, policy-relevant agenda, perhaps orchestrated by lead speakers, would ensure that Environment Ministers can make a substantial impact and develop a strategic environmental vision for the organization. In addition, they should consider the adoption of harmonized priorities and budget for the biennium, after prior consideration by the Committee of the Whole. All other agenda items should be brought to conclusion by the Committee of the Whole for adoption by the plenary. Overall, the agenda should reflect a mission commonly subscribed to, set strategic direction and, ultimately, lead to a reduction in special meetings being called for separate issues and to greater synergy among activities in other spheres.

28. Permanent representatives are the regular counterparts and channels of communication between UNEP and Governments. Positive and constructive dialogue should continue to be a priority in order to improve coordination and effectiveness. There is also room for improvement in the communication between the permanent representative and the Minister of Environment in the capital. The secretariat's direct contacts with Ministers of Environment, who constitute its basic constituency, should be conveyed to Permanent Representatives. Timely advance dissemination of appropriate and well-prepared agendas and documentation for meetings must be ensured. These problems and shortcomings are recognized by Governments, their Permanent Representatives and the UNEP secretariat. Consultations to find solutions and improvements continue.

29. The involvement of non-governmental entities is valuable in evaluating new policies and proposals, bringing new perspectives, broadening the consensus and reducing insularity. They should be encouraged to take an active part in the debate. Daily briefing meetings during Governing Council sessions could be organized, as well as satellite meetings as a structured open forum for discussion followed by formal Governing Council consideration. Thus, UNEP could be innovative in encouraging a multi-sectoral approach, allowing for meaningful involvement of civil society.

30. The attendance and meaningful participation of representatives of environment-related conventions, their Conference of Parties and Secretariats, as well as other United Nations bodies should be sought.

## B. Reform of structure

31. UNEP's current governance regime has its roots in Stockholm, 25 years ago. With more complex issues and an increased number of new institutional mechanisms on the scene, it is understandable that the original structure

would come under scrutiny. Both the bodies formally established by the Governing Council (the Bureau and the Committee of Permanent Representatives) and the informal ones (ad hoc consultations with selected Ministers and regional Ministerial meetings) have played a significant part in the evolution of UNEP. The creation of new bodies is viewed with apprehension by some Governments as being potentially costly, and may not guarantee the effectiveness desired unless streamlining of the entire regime occurs. Transforming the mandates, membership and modus operandi of existing bodies may achieve greater acceptance and results.

## C. Governing Council

32. The Governing Council is the pre-eminent intergovernmental mechanism for formulation and appraisal of broad environmental policy matters. It provides the strategic vision of the Environment Programme. It is the main forum where Governments pursue the environmental dialogue to build and deepen the political understanding required for enhanced environmental cooperation and to generate the impetus for action. Its mandate, as originally conceived in General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, remains valid.

33. Universal participation in the biennial sessions of the Governing Council is desirable, particularly considering the universal nature of the environmental problem. Other bodies of the United Nations system, especially those of a specialized character such as the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and, more recently, WTO and GEF, would appear to have linked universality to the question of periodicity in the interest of financial and time considerations. The more universal the membership the less frequent an assembly. After a period of analysis and debate, the General Assembly in 1987 decided that the Governing Council would meet biennially. The costs to Governments and the additional burden placed on the secretariat were mentioned as the main disadvantages outweighing the advantages of annual meetings. Special sessions of the Governing Council could continue to be held as and when needed.

34. Periodicity is also linked to the existence of a smaller, accountable executive body to provide regular political guidance and to exercise oversight of the organization between sessions. Other organizations such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) have established a smaller representative and democratic body that is not universal but which meets frequently.

35. In the specialized field of environment, the involvement of Ministers of Environment is essential. The Governing Council should continue to be held in advance of the yearly meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development.

## D. Intersessional body

36. To respond to the observations about UNEP's political effectiveness, to provide clearer and more coherent policy direction and more effective oversight, the designation of a smaller intersessional body is crucial. In order to avoid being marginalized, political momentum between sessions of the Governing Council must be maintained.

37. Although the models vary, most, if not all, United Nations organizations, including those which have recently undertaken reform and restructuring measures, such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), or those newly created, such as WTO and GEF, have such bodies.

38. The governing bodies of UNICEF and UNDP/United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) were recently transformed into Executive Boards of 36 member States, meeting in four shortened sessions per year. Their experience to date, as articulated in the report of the Secretary-General to the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly (A/49/558), indicates that the boards have become more action-oriented, concentrating on establishing new and more business-like working methods. Documentation has been significantly reduced in volume. Written statements are used less frequently and the deliberations are coming closer to a dialogue. Decision-making procedures have been streamlined. Nevertheless, observers have participated in all formal sessions and the consensus principle has been maintained.

39. Because these bodies are the key governing structure, rather than an intersessional body accountable to a larger, senior and more inclusive body, there remain some concerns from developing countries about the adequacy of their participation in an increased number of meetings in view of the small size of their missions and the financial considerations in providing representatives from capitals. The impact of the frequency of sessions on conference services, including translation of documentation at least six weeks prior to meetings, is being monitored.

40. At the time that UNEP's Governing Council met annually, an ad hoc intersessional working group was created to generate mid-term policy guidance and advice from capitals. Whether Governments considered it too costly to send representatives from capitals or whether it was because the consultations were of an advisory nature only, these consultations were discontinued.

41. None of the existing intersessional institutional arrangements had or has formal decision-making powers derived from the powers of the Governing Council itself. In the past, Governments would only accept a body with such powers if there were to arise an overriding need for decision-making in between sessions, and in cases where there was such a need, the construction of convening a special session of the Governing Council with its accepted geographically distributed membership was used.

42. A well-defined operational mandate is required for a body empowered to carry it out, but directly accountable to the Governing Council. The mandate should include two elements: provision of policy guidance within the framework of Governing Council decisions, and monitoring the performance of the organization, without the burden of micromanagement. The body would review the status of implementation of UNEP's work programme. It would also, at the request of the Executive Director or the President, discuss and provide guidance on necessary changes to the orientation or emphasis in the programme budget and/or the medium-term plan prior to submission to the General Assembly. It could, furthermore, act as the preparatory body for Governing Council sessions.

43. The distinct intersessional body would be chaired by the President of the Governing Council and must function in a democratic and transparent way. The body could be given certain decision-making powers, provided the composition is high-level and fully representative of the Governing Council. It would, of course, be accountable for these decisions to the Governing Council. The decision-making powers of the body could not exceed the parameters set by Governing Council. They should also respect the prerogatives of the Executive Director.

44. The body should be of limited size (15-20 members) and membership should bring broad environmental competence. Ideally, it should meet every six months for a short duration, depending on the frequency of Governing Council meetings. Consideration could be given to allow for the body to meet more frequently at the request of the Executive Director when the need to discuss certain emerging issues arises. Proposed elements for terms of reference are attached as annex 4. Periodically, the body could meet in different regions and meet in association with regional Ministerial meetings or with sessions of the Commission on Sustainable Development.

45. Three options could meet these requirements:

(a) A body elected from the membership of the Governing Council, based on the current formula for geographical representation;

(b) The Bureau of the Governing Council, extended to include, for instance, the Chairs of regional groups and/or representatives from capitals;

(c) A transformation of the current Committee of Permanent Representatives so that its Bureau would be representative of Governing Council membership. It could then serve as the core of the body, supplemented by delegates from capitals and the Bureau of the Governing Council.

46. It is important to note that under either of these options the Committee of Permanent Representatives could continue in an advisory capacity to the intersessional body and, ultimately, to the Governing Council.

47. Consideration could be given to having members of the body function not as representatives of their national Governments, but rather as representatives of their respective regional groups. Of increasing importance to the work and activities of UNEP are meetings of Ministers of Environment organized regionally. In two regions, UNEP provides the secretariat to those meetings and the meetings have been used by the Ministers, inter alia, to preview the Governing Council agenda and articulate priorities for the implementation of UNEP's programme of work in the region. These initiatives are useful and should be encouraged in other regions. Through the Chairman, their constituency could be represented in two of the options proposed for an intersessional body.

48. The costs of a three-day meeting every six months, under either of the three options, could be partially accommodated by reducing the number of meetings of task forces and subcommittees of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, while maintaining the formal quarterly meeting of the Committee. For example, to date in 1996, 21 meetings other than the formal

quarterly meetings have cost approximately US$ 63,000. Six meeting days of the intersessional body in the same time period could range between US$ 52,000, if serviced at the same level as the formal meetings of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, and US$ 160,000, if in three languages with 100 pages of pre-sessional documentation, 10 pages in-session, 20 pages post-session, and assuming interpreters are locally hired. A reduction in the number of days of the Governing Council session from 10 to 8 could also be envisaged.

## IV. CONCLUSION

49. UNEP must evolve into an organization that acts clearly and unambiguously as the world's environmental agency, providing principal environmental inputs into the sustainable development agenda and shaping global environmental consensus. This is a collective responsibility of all parties concerned. General Assembly resolution 45/264 of 13 May 1991, on the subject of restructuring and revitalization, concluded that restructuring is primarily an intergovernmental responsibility. A professionally excellent secretariat can and should assist and cooperate, but political will is an essential prerequisite for ensuring good governance.

## V. SUGGESTED ACTION BY THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

50. The Governing Council may wish to:

(1) Take note of the report of the Executive Director;

(2) Note with appreciation the actions already taken to reform the working methods of the governing structures and adopt the remaining proposals contained in the report;

(3) Reconfirm the centrality of the Governing Council, its mandate and periodicity, and adopt a draft decision concerning universality of membership of the Governing Council of UNEP to be submitted to the General Assembly at its next session;

(4) Decide to designate an intersessional body, whose terms of reference are contained in Annex 4 to the present report.

Annex 1

## Decision 18/2. Review of the governing structures of the United Nations Environment Programme

The Governing Council,

Recognizing that there is a need periodically to review and refine the governing structures of the United Nations Environment Programme if its functions and responsibilities, as set out in General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, are to be fulfilled in the most efficient, effective and transparent manner,

Desiring to take the necessary steps to improve its structures in order to ensure achievement of these goals,

Determined to strengthen the United Nations Environment Programme to enable it to fulfil its role as the central United Nations organ for the environment,

1. Decides to review at its nineteenth regular session the governing structures of the United Nations Environment Programme with a view to itself taking action or, where necessary, recommending the General Assembly to take action to modify and streamline those structures to produce in them greater efficiency, effectiveness and transparency;

2. Requests the Executive Director to propose options to this effect to the Governing Council at its nineteenth session, after consultation with Governments.

10th meeting
26 May 1995

Annex 2

Actions taken to implement Governing Council decision 18/2

In response to this mandate the following actions were undertaken:

(a) Two circular letters were sent to all Governments on 21 November and 13 December 1995, requesting their general views on the governance of UNEP and apprising them of the timetable for consultations to comply with Governing Council decision 18/2;

(b) A discussion on the subject was held with the Bureau of the Governing Council on 23 January 1996;

(c) Various consultations were undertaken with government representatives, permanent representatives in Nairobi, Environment Ministers and other government officials. The documentation for these consultations was made available to the Committee of Permanent Representatives and they were briefed on the outcome. In addition, all Governing Council members were invited to an informal consultation in New York on May 4 1996, on the margins of the meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development;

(d) The Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP established a Task Force on Governance, under the chairmanship of Norway. After consideration by the Committee of Permanent Representatives, a report was forwarded to the Executive Director on 30 August 1996;

(e) At the same time, the Nairobi chapter of the Group of 77 and China convened a working group on UNEP governance, chaired by Bangladesh;

(f) A historical review of the development of the UNEP governance structures was undertaken and made available;

(g) A factual analysis of the governing structures of selected relevant organizations was undertaken. The analysis makes no judgements about the effectiveness or desirability of those systems, and has limited value without an understanding of the purpose and culture of each organization.

## Annex 3

## Mandates of existing UNEP governing structures

### I. UNEP GOVERNING COUNCIL

1. Membership of the UNEP Governing Council, consisting of 58 States serving a four-year term, is determined through election by the General Assembly, with half of the members being elected every two years (resolution 42/185 of the United Nations General Assembly of 11 December 1987). The Governing Council was assigned various responsibilities by the General Assembly in its resolution 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, which decided that:

"the Governing Council shall have the following main functions and responsibilities:

"(a) To promote international cooperation in the field of the environment and to recommend, as appropriate, policies to this end;

"(b) To provide general policy guidance for the direction and coordination of environmental programmes within the United Nations system;

"(c) To receive and review the periodic reports of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, referred to in section II, paragraph 2, below, on the implementation of environmental programmes within the United Nations system;

"(d) To keep under review the world environmental situation in order to ensure that emerging environmental problems of wide international significance receive appropriate and adequate consideration by Governments;

"(e) To promote the contribution of the relevant international scientific and other professional communities to the acquisition, assessment and exchange of environmental knowledge and information and, as appropriate, to the technical aspects of the formulation and implementation of environmental programmes within the United Nations system;

"(f) To maintain under continuing review the impact of national and international environmental policies and measures on developing countries, as well as the problem of additional costs that may be incurred by developing countries in the implementation of environmental programmes and projects, and to ensure that such programmes and projects shall be compatible with the development plans and priorities of those countries;

"(g) To review and approve annually the programme of utilization of resources of the Environment Fund referred to in Section III below."

In addition, by the same resolution, the General Assembly decided:

> "that the Governing Council shall report annually to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council, which will transmit to the Assembly such comments on the report as it may deem necessary, particularly with regard to questions of coordination and to the relationship of environmental policies and programmes within the United Nations system to overall economic and social policies and priorities."

2. Initially, the Governing Council met on an annual basis. In 1979, the Governing Council considered the issue of the frequency and duration of Governing Council sessions, but decided that it would continue its annual sessions until 1983 and that it would re-examine the issue in 1982 (Governing Council decision 7/1). In 1982, the Governing Council concluded that consideration would be given to convening sessions of the Governing Council every two years, but delayed making a final recommendation to the General Assembly until 1983 (Governing Council decision 10/1). At its eleventh session, in 1983, the Governing Council postponed the decision to meet biennially again until 1987, with no Governing Council session to be held in 1986, on an experimental basis (Governing Council decision 11/2). Finally, in 1987, the United Nations General Assembly decided, by its resolution 42/185 of 11 December 1987, "Biennial cycle of sessions of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme", that the UNEP Governing Council should meet on a biennial basis, beginning in 1989, and that there should be no regular session in 1988. It should be noted that there has in fact been only one year, 1986, when there was no session of the Governing Council, as special sessions of the Governing Council were held in 1988, 1990 and 1992, and a one-day session was held on GEF in 1994.

3. While the composition and substantive competence of the Governing Council are defined by General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972, the process by which the Governing Council discharges its functions and responsibilities, namely, its internal rules of procedure, is determined by the decisions of the Council itself and the rules of procedure of the Governing Council, adopted by the Governing Council in its decision 19 (II) of 11 March 1974.

4. States non-members and intergovernmental organizations, as well as accredited non-governmental organizations, may attend sessions of the Governing Council as observers. Observers have no right to vote.

## II. BUREAU OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

5. The rules of procedure (rules 18-23) of the Governing Council define the Bureau of the Governing Council. In particular, rule 18 states:

> "1. At the commencement of the first meeting of its regular session, the Governing Council shall elect a President, three Vice-Presidents and a Rapporteur from among its members. These officers shall constitute the Bureau of the Governing Council. The Bureau shall assist the President in the general conduct of business of the Governing Council. The Chairmen of such sessional committees or

working parties as may be established under rule 60 below shall be invited to participate in meetings of the Bureau.

"2. In electing its officers, the Governing Council shall have due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation.

"3. The offices of President and Rapporteur of the Governing Council shall normally be subject to rotation among the five groups of States referred to in section I, paragraph 1, of General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII)."

Rule 19 states:

"The President, the Vice-Presidents and the Rapporteur shall hold office until their successors are elected. Subject to the provisions of rule 18, they shall be eligible for re-election. None of them may hold office after the expiration of the term of office of the member of which he is a representative."

6. During the intersessional period, the Executive Director may consult with the Bureau on Governing Council-related issues.

## III. THE COMMITTEE OF PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES

7. Rule 62 of the rules of procedure of the Governing Council states that the Governing Council may establish such subsidiary organs on a permanent or ad hoc basis as may be necessary for the effective discharge of its functions and, as required, expert groups to consider specific problems and make recommendations. The rules of procedure of such subsidiary organs are those of the Governing Council, subject to such modifications as the Governing Council may decide upon in the light of proposals by the subsidiary organs themselves. Each subsidiary organ may also adopt its own priorities within the framework of the work programme established by the Governing Council. In consultation with the Executive Director, such subsidiary organs may meet as necessary.

8. In 1975, a system of informal consultations between Governments and the Executive Director was established "to exchange views on issues of policy and to consider items which would not normally be considered in depth at sessions of the Governing Council, for example, any difficulties facing the Executive Director in the implementation of Governing Council decisions and any proposals of the Executive Director for new programme activities" (Governing Council decision 23 (III) of 2 May 1975). The consultations were to be held twice annually. In 1977 the Executive Director was again directed to hold informal discussions with Governments to review selected documents, comment on pilot presentations of documents, to seek advice on the information Governments need, to exchange views on policy, and to consider any other items on which the Executive Director should wish to report (Governing Council decision 104 (V) of 27 May 1977). The Executive Director was also requested to conduct consultations with Governments of member States of the Governing Council on the advisability and feasibility of the Governing Council approving projects of UNEP, and to develop further the means of maintaining regular communication on programme and related developments

between the secretariat and Governments, in particular through effective liaison with national representatives accredited to the Programme (Governing Council decision 82 (V) of 25 May 1977).

9. In 1983, the Governing Council decided to discontinue the intersessional informal consultations with Governments, and to invite permanent representatives to the Programme at Nairobi and/or Government-designated officials to meet the Executive Director at least three times a year. This group was to consider administrative, budgetary and programme matters, and to review progress in the implementation of the programme and Governing Council decisions, as well as specific issues proposed by the permanent representatives or the Executive Director. The Governing Council also recommended that a core group of 18 members should meet more frequently to discuss specific items of importance to the Governing Council, including facilitating the preparations for Governing Council sessions, monitoring and advising on the implementation of Governing Council decisions, and putting into effect the work programme established for the group by the Governing Council (Governing Council decision 11/2, paragraph 3, of 23 May 1983).

10. By decision 13/2 of 13 May 1985, the Governing Council, recalling its decision 11/2 of 23 May 1983, and in accordance with rule 62 of its rules of procedure, established an open-ended Committee of Permanent Representatives, consisting of permanent representatives to the Programme and/or government-designated officials, to consider and make recommendations to the Council on the matters mentioned in decision 11/2, paragraph 3, and to take action on any other matters specifically entrusted to it by the Council. The Governing Council further decided that this Committee would meet regularly with the Executive Director or his representative on the first Wednesday of February, September and December of each year and six weeks prior to the opening of the fourteenth session of the Governing Council, as well as whenever deemed necessary by the Committee or by the Executive Director.

11. The Committee of Permanent Representatives is therefore a subsidiary body of the UNEP Governing Council, subject to the rules of procedure of the Council (subject to modifications as noted above) and established to consider and make recommendations and take action on matters specifically entrusted to it by the Council.

12. Over the years since the establishment of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, the Executive Director has been requested to consult with it on various issues including: the implementation of the supplementary programme as and when additional resources became available (Governing Council decisions 15/1 and 16/44); views on conclusions presented in a consultancy report on the organization and management of UNEP (Governing Council decision 16/6); proposals for enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of UNEP in fulfilling its mandate (decision III/2 of the 1992 special session of the Governing Council); and assessing the implementation of Governing Council decisions, especially the execution of programme activities and their budgetary implications (Governing Council decision 17/43). The Executive Director has also been requested to keep the Committee of Permanent Representatives informed of various matters including: the allocation and utilization of funds for information activities (Governing Council decision 13/22); the status of the Environment Fund (Governing Council decision 16/44); programme implementation and planning, including

expenditure and income profiles and planning assumptions at the programme activity level (Governing Council decisions 16/44 and 17/32); the full text of memoranda of understanding between UNEP and other United Nations agencies (Governing Council decision 17/8); and participation of UNEP in GEF (Governing Council decision 17/40).

13. In 1993, the development of the role of the Committee of Permanent Representatives was again addressed by the Governing Council (Governing Council decision 17/43). In that decision, the Council, noting the report of the Committee of Permanent Representatives on proposals for enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of UNEP in fulfilling its mandate, contained in annex IV of document UNEP/GC.17/32 and, in particular paragraphs 8-9 thereof, concerning the need to clarify and develop some aspects of the role of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, decided that the Committee of Permanent Representatives should meet regularly and assess, in cooperation with the Executive Director, the implementation of Governing Council decisions, especially the execution of programme activities and their budgetary implications. The Governing Council also requested the Executive Director to provide the Committee, sufficiently in advance of its meetings, with whatever information the Committee required on the matters it decided to put on its agenda. The Committee of Permanent Representatives was to make recommendations on those matters and present them to the Executive Director for consideration and further reporting to the Committee.

14. In short, the Committee of Permanent Representatives has the mandate to consider all matters relevant to UNEP, including its programme and the implementing and financing thereof. It can do so on its own initiative and at the request of the Executive Director. The Executive Director is authorized by the Governing Council to provide the Committee of Permanent Representatives with relevant information. The Committee of Permanent Representatives can make recommendations to the Executive Director and to the Governing Council itself, but its role is purely advisory: it cannot take binding decisions on behalf of the Governing Council.

Annex 4

## Elements for terms of reference of the intersessional advisory body

1. (The intersessional advisory body (hereinafter referred to as the "Executive Board") shall have (19) (another number reflecting the regional distribution of seats of the Governing Council) members, elected by the Governing Council from its Members at the highest, preferably ministerial level). (The intersessional advisory body (hereinafter referred to as the "Executive Board") shall comprise the members of the Bureau of the UNEP Governing Council, the members of the Bureau of the Committee of Permanent Representatives, and five representatives from capitals, preferably at the ministerial level, designated by the regional groups.)

2. The Executive Board shall have due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation.

3. The term of each member of the Executive Board shall be for two years, that term commencing at the end of each session of the Governing Council and terminating at the start of the following session of the Governing Council.

4. Members of the Executive Board are eligible for re-election.

5. No member of the Executive Board may hold office after the expiration of the term of office of the Governing Council member for which he or she is a representative.

6. The rules of procedure of the Executive Board shall be those of the Governing Council, as appropriate, subject to such modifications as the Governing Council may decide upon in the light of proposals by the Executive Board itself.

7. The Executive Board shall meet between sessions of the UNEP Governing Council, the first meeting to be convened six months after the conclusion of each session of the Governing Council, the second meeting to be held six months thereafter, the third meeting to be convened six months prior to the following session of the Governing Council and a final meeting to be held prior to and in preparation for the Governing Council. (Alternatively, the Executive Board shall meet once during the intersessional period, one year after each session of the Governing Council.)

8. At the commencement of the first meeting after each session of the Governing Council, the Executive Board shall elect a President (alternatively, this may be the President of the Bureau of the Governing Council), three Vice-Presidents and a Rapporteur.

9. The Executive Board shall review (and may take decisions related to) (and provide advice on) the status of implementation of the programme of work of UNEP and other decisions of the Governing Council, within the limits set by the Governing Council.

10. The Executive Board shall also provide high level guidance to the Executive Director, on request, on necessary changes to the orientation or emphasis in the programme budget and/or medium-term plan prior to their submission to the General Assembly.

11. The Executive Board may also convene at the request of the Executive Director or the President to discuss, inter alia, emerging issues and other priority matters.

12. The Executive Board shall be accountable to the Governing Council for any decisions taken, with due respect for the prerogatives of the Executive Director.

---

UN

UNITED NATIONS

EP

# Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

PROPERTY OF

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/11
14 October 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (c) of the provisional agenda*

POLICY ISSUES

COORDINATION OF CONVENTION SECRETARIATS

Report of the Executive Director

Summary

1. Agenda 21, chapter 38, paragraph 22 (h), emphasized among the priority areas on which UNEP should concentrate "coordinating functions arising from an increasing number of international legal agreements, inter alia, the functioning of the secretariats of the Conventions, taking into account the need for the most efficient use of resources, including possible co-location of secretariats established in the future."

2. UNEP Governing Council decision 17/25 requested the Executive Director to promote the coherent coordination of the functioning of environmental conventions, including their secretariats, with a view to improving the effectiveness of the implementation of the conventions.

3. Accordingly, the Executive Director has convened five meetings on Coordination of Secretariats of Environmental Conventions. These meetings, serviced by the UNEP secretariat, have provided a forum for UNEP to meet with both UNEP-administered and other relevant convention secretariats to discuss issues and allow for enhanced cooperation and complementarity of activities amongst the participant organizations.

* UNEP/GC.19/1.



Na.96-0606 171096 181096

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

(a) Acknowledge the important task assigned to UNEP by Agenda 21, chapter 38, paragraph 22 (h), and reaffirm the importance of UNEP's role in promoting and supporting cooperation and coordination with and amongst environmental agreements and their secretariats;

(b) Welcome the actions undertaken by the Executive Director to facilitate the relationship with the secretariats;

(c) Urge Governments as Parties to the relevant conventions to encourage the convention secretariats to continue to participate actively in the coordination process;

(d) Stress the need for UNEP and the convention secretariats to have the financial and personnel capacity to maintain an adequate level of coordination and cooperation;

(e) Encourage the Executive Director to continue to promote synergy amongst the work and activities of relevant environmental agreements and their secretariats as well as UNEP's work programme in order to promote environmentally sound and sustainable development in a most efficient and effective way.

## I. ACTION TAKEN

1. While the first meeting on Coordination of Secretariats of Environmental Conventions was limited to UNEP-administered convention secretariats and some observers, the participation in and the scope of discussion have since broadened to encompass other secretariats and include on the agenda a number of important issues.

2. The first meeting, which was convened in Geneva, from 28 to 30 March 1994, took the opportunity to discuss, inter alia, the objectives, scope and content of coordination of convention secretariats as well as several issues which were seen to be common to the secretariats and which might be elaborated at a later stage (UNEP/ELI/Coord.1/8).

3. The second meeting, held on the margins of the eighteenth session of the UNEP Governing Council in Nairobi, from 14 to 16 May 1995, provided an opportunity, inter alia, to reaffirm the importance and value of cooperation and coordinated actions between and among all conventions and international organizations focusing on environmental matters, recognizing that such cooperation requires human and financial resources. The meeting further recognized that UNEP would facilitate such cooperation and had the responsibility to coordinate UNEP programmes as approved by the Governing Council with the activities and programmes of all relevant convention secretariats, as approved by the Parties to their conventions (UNEP/GC.18/Inf.6).

4. From 3 to 5 July 1995, the third meeting on Coordination of Secretariats of Environmental Conventions in Geneva discussed a number of substantive issues including, inter alia, trade-related issues and Host Government agreements (UNEP/ELI/Coord.3/4). The next meeting, on 10 and 11 January 1996, followed up on the discussions of the previous meetings and introduced a number of new issues for discussion, including the Global Programme of Action to Protect the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities and Strengthening Compliance with and Implementation of Environmental Conventions. That meeting also broadened its participation to include regional conventions, providing an important new perspective to discussions (UNEP/DEP/Coord.4/6).

5. The latest meeting was convened on 4 and 5 June 1996 in Geneva and reflected the most ambitious agenda to date. From a substantive perspective, the meeting dealt with a wide range of issues including a debriefing on the fourth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), the implementation status of the Global Programme of Action to Protect the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities, and a report on UNEP's work, in collaboration with the convention secretariats, on analysis of the effectiveness of trade measures and trade impacts of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

6. That meeting also discussed the processes in place for action on prior informed consent (PIC) and persistent organic pollutants (POPs), and the convening of an open-ended intergovernmental workshop on cooperation between the Convention on Biological Diversity and other international conventions on related matters. Additionally, the UNEP secretariat presented a proposal for legal capacity-building activities to be undertaken jointly by UNEP and the convention secretariats in selected countries (UNEP/DPER/Coord.5/5).

## II. CONCLUSIONS

7. The meetings continue to provide an opportunity for UNEP and those convention secretariats administered by it to deal with administrative and financial matters. This has been facilitated by the presence of appropriate senior UNEP staff members at the meetings to address outstanding issues in these areas. The meetings also allow UNEP to consult with the secretariats in the development of UNEP's own work programme. In that regard, the report of the fifth meeting notes in its paragraph 10 that the UNEP work programme for the 1998/99 biennium "...would be provided to the convention secretariats for comment after it was revised on the basis of the discussions in UNEP's Management Board of 6 and 7 July 1996."

8. The coordination process is proving to be an effective forum to discuss both difficult administrative and important substantive matters.

---

UNITED NATIONS

EP

Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/12
16 October 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (c) of the provisional agenda*

# IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES 1/

## REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ON COORDINATION TO THE UNEP GOVERNING COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE FIELD OF THE ENVIRONMENT

### Introduction

1. The present report is submitted to the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) by the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 2997 (XXVII) of 15 December 1972 on "Institutional and Financial Arrangements for the International Environmental Cooperation" and 32/197 of 20 December 1977 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, as well as UNEP Governing Council decision 18/27 B of 25 May 1995 which, inter alia, requested ACC to continue to report to the Council at its regular sessions.

2. The topic of "Implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities" was selected for the current report in consultation with members of ACC.

---

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

1/ The UNEP secretariat will apprise the Governing Council at its nineteenth session of any developments of relevance that may have taken place subsequent to the endorsement of this report by the ACC.

Na.96-0624 221096 231096

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

3. The bulk of the world's population live in coastal areas and there is a continuing trend towards further concentration in these areas. The health, well-being and, in some cases, the very survival of coastal populations depend on the state of the environment of coastal systems, estuaries and wetlands as well as their associated watersheds and drainage basins and near-shore coastal waters. However, the major threats to the health, productivity and biodiversity of the marine environment result from human activities on land. Most of the pollution loads, including municipal, industrial and agricultural wastes and run-off, as well as atmospheric deposition, emanate from land-based activities and affect the most productive areas of the marine environment, including estuaries and near-shore coastal waters. Many observations indicate that marine oil pollution from land-based sources may be higher than that from sea-based origins.

4. In responding to the need for international action, the UNEP Governing Council in its decision 10/24 of 31 May 1982 initiated a process leading subsequently to the adoption in 1985 of the Montreal Guidelines for the Protection of the Marine Environment Against Pollution from Land-based Sources. In addition, the UNEP/World Meteorological Organization (WMO)-sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) made a number of relevant recommendations concerning the impact of climate change on coastal zone management. Following the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), which placed protection of the marine environment in the context of sustainable development, the Governing Council in its decision 17/20 of 21 May 1993 mandated the Executive Director of UNEP to initiate a preparatory process for the purpose of facilitating the adoption by Governments of a global programme of action for the protection of the marine environment from land-based activities. Pursuant to that decision, the Intergovernmental Conference to Adopt a Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities was convened in Washington D.C. from 23 October to 3 November 1995. The Global Programme of Action as well as the Washington Declaration on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities were adopted on 3 November 1995.

5. A number of United Nations agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations participated in the process leading to the Washington Conference and in the conference itself. The following United Nations specialized agencies and organizations of the United Nations system were present at the Conference: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), International Maritime Organization (IMO), Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO/IOC), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), World Bank, World Health Organization (WHO), World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and Global Environment Facility (GEF).

6. The Global Programme of Action adopted at the Washington Conference contained a request to UNEP to prepare a proposal setting forth a specific plan for implementing the institutional arrangements contained in the Global Programme of Action. The UNEP proposals were subsequently discussed at the Inter-sessional Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), which met in New York from 26 February to

1 March 1996, and by the CSD itself at its fourth session. In line with the request of the Commission and in accordance with its recommendations, UNEP has prepared a revised version of the Global Programme of Action implementation plan. The draft proposals will be circulated for consideration of involved United Nations agencies and organizations prior to the nineteenth session of the UNEP Governing Council.

7. In considering the follow-up to the Washington Conference, CSD prepared a draft General Assembly decision, subsequently endorsed by the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) at its 1996 session, recommending that the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution on "Institutional Arrangements for the Implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities". This draft resolution endorses, inter alia, the Washington Declaration and the Global Programme of Action and stresses the need for international and interagency cooperation for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

8. The draft resolution of the General Assembly as prepared by CSD contains, inter alia, the invitation for States to take action for the formal endorsement by each competent international organization of those parts of the Global Programme of Action which are relevant to their mandates and to accord appropriate priority to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action in the work programme of each organization. The governing bodies of the following organizations are to be invited to take action: UNEP, UNDP, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) (Habitat), FAO, WHO, IMO, IAEA, International Labour Organization (ILO), UNIDO, UNESCO/IOC, the relevant bodies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, as well as other competent international and regional organizations within and outside the United Nations system.

Global Programme of Action - involvement of the whole United Nations system

9. The Global Programme of Action stipulates that, for its effective implementation, UNEP should maintain a close partnership with other organizations and bodies, such as IMO, WHO, FAO, WMO, UNDP, UNIDO, UNESCO/IOC, IAEA, the World Bank and regional development banks, GEF and UNCHS as well as regional bodies supporting the implementation of regional seas and relevant freshwater programmes. The Global Programme of Action stresses that an appropriate division of tasks is of utmost importance to ensure its efficient and cost-effective implementation.

10. The Global Programme of Action implementation plan was prepared by UNEP after a series of consultations with various United Nations organizations as well as other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. The inter-agency consultations to review the UNEP Proposal for Coordinating Agency Activities in Support of Implementation of the Global Programme of Action were held in New York on 30 January 1996 and included the participation of, inter alia, the United Nations Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD), the United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea (UN/DOALOS), UNIDO, IAEA, WHO, IMO, FAO, WMO, UNDP, the Coordination Unit for the Mediterranean Action Plan (MEDU) of UNEP, World Conservation Union - IUCN, the World Bank, as well as Commission Permanente del Pacifico Sur (CPPS), the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), and UNESCO/IOC.

11. The agencies participating in the meeting welcomed UNEP's role as Secretariat in facilitating the implementation of the Global Programme of Action. They also agreed that specific responsibilities, the designation of lead agencies/ organizations and priorities would have to be clearly identified. It was also stressed that more emphasis should be placed on the partnerships of UNEP with other agencies and organizations in implementing the Global Programme of Action.

12. In the proposal submitted by UNEP to CSD at its fourth session on the institutional arrangements and Implementation of the Global Programme of Action, the collaboration of UNEP with the partner agencies places Global Programme of Action implementation in a wider context, encompassing, inter alia, concern for human health (WHO); productivity of coastal areas (FAO); loss of biodiversity (Convention on Biological Diversity and others); retarded development and poverty (UNDP); shifting demographic patterns (UNCHS); declining food security (FAO, World Food Programme (WFP)); global environment change (International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme - (IGBP) of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU); nature conservation (World Wildlife Fund - (WWF), World Conservation Union - IUCN); marine pollution monitoring and radiation protection (IAEA); and others. Subsequently, WMO has also expressed interest in being involved in relevant activities.

## Inter-agency coordination in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action

### The role of UNEP

13. UNEP's proposal on institutional arrangements and implementation of the Global Programme of Action (to be presented to the Governing Council at its nineteenth session) was submitted to the ad hoc Working Group of CSD and to the Commission itself at its fourth session. It is being revised along the lines of the draft General Assembly resolution as prepared by the fourth session of CSD, and addresses comments and suggestions provided by Governments.

14. The Washington Conference designated UNEP the Secretariat of the Global Programme of Action, with the task of promoting and facilitating its implementation at the national, regional and global levels. In this respect UNEP will attempt to ensure the coordination of the relevant activities within its own programme and facilitate the coordination of relevant activities of partner agencies in the United Nations system with respect to activities in which they play a leading role. UNEP's role as Secretariat of the Global Programme of Action will include, in particular, the establishment of the clearing-house mechanism, including consultations with concerned United Nations agencies on the design of the mechanism and the convening of intergovernmental meetings to review progress in Global Programme of Action implementation.

15. As stipulated in the Global Programme of Action, UNEP is coordinating its implementation in particular through its Regional Seas Programmes. The existing Regional Seas Programmes provide a "ready-made" programmatic, institutional and legal framework and organizational infrastructure for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action and also benefit from mutually supportive activities undertaken in a wider global framework.

The Global Programme of Action Coordination Office

16. An interim Global Programme of Action Coordination Office has been established within the UNEP Water Branch, in order to assist in the discharging of UNEP's secretariat functions as the focal point for the coordinated implementation of the programme.

17. In addition, the Global Programme of Action Coordination Office will facilitate the collaboration of partner agencies in a number of specific fields including, inter alia:

- collection, analysis, evaluation and dissemination of data relevant to the Global Programme of Action;

- assistance in formulation of national, subregional and regional action programmes;

- strengthening existing or fostering the creation of new regional and subregional cooperative arrangements related to the Global Programme of Action;

- assistance for strengthening or building national capacities for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

Steering Committee for the Global Programme of Action

18. To facilitate technical coordination and cooperation, a Steering Committee for the Global Programme of Action will be formed, with representation from regional and international organizations which have primary roles and responsibilities in its implementation. According to the proposal, the meetings of the Committee would be organized by the Coordination Office and chaired by the representative of UNEP. The meetings would review the status of the implementation of the programme, experience gained, problems encountered, assistance required, plans for the forthcoming period and ways and means to provide effective support to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action through improved cooperation between UNEP and its partner agencies, including WHO, FAO, IAEA, IMO, WMO and UNESCO/IOC. It has been proposed that the ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas be considered to perform the functions of the Steering Committee.

The ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas

19. At its fourth session in May 1996, the ACC Subcommittee on Oceans and Coastal Areas agreed that the Global Programme of Action and its future implementation plans would be considered as the cooperative programme framework for programme areas A and B (ii) as set forth in chapter 17 of Agenda 21 "Protection of the Oceans, all kinds of seas, including enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, and coastal areas and the protection, rational use and development of their living resources". To allow for appropriate inter-agency consultation on related policy aspects, the Subcommittee will include a specific agenda item on the Global Programme of Action at each of its annual meetings. It was noted that technical aspects could be discussed in conjunction with meetings of GESAMP (the Group of Experts on the Scientific

Aspects of Marine Pollution, sponsored by IMO, FAO, UNESCO/IOC, WMO, WHO, IAEA and the United Nations and UNEP). An informal meeting of the Subcommittee is expected in November 1996 (IMO, London) to focus on Global Programme of Action implementation and prepare recommendations to be considered at the fifth session of the Subcommittee (January 1997: World Bank, Washington, D.C.). UNEP will assume the Chair of the Subcommittee, and the United Nations the Vice-Chair, as of 1 January 1997. The Secretariat will continue to be provided by UNESCO/IOC.

The ACC Subcommittee on Water

20. The ACC Subcommittee on Water will discuss its role and the Global Programme of Action implementation at its forthcoming meeting (7-11 October 1996).

Regional implementation of the Global Programme of Action

21. The Intersecretariat Consultation on Implementation of the Global Programme of Action (Geneva, 13-14 May 1996) convened by UNEP, discussed, inter alia, the possibilities of improving regional cooperation between agencies and the role of these agencies in implementing the Global Programme of Action at the regional level. The consultation was attended by regional programmes (Black Sea Environmental Programme, Caribbean Environment Programme, South-East Pacific Action Plan, Mediterranean Action Plan, North-West Pacific Action Plan, Oslo and Paris Commissions, South Asia Environment Cooperation Programme, South Pacific Regional Environment Programme) as well as by UNEP's Regional Office for Europe, the Division of Environmental Information and Assessment, United Nations System-wide Earthwatch, UNEP's Global Environment Facility Unit and the Water Branch. UNEP's plans for coordinating and facilitating implementation of the Global Programme of Action were also considered, including the role for the regional secretariats as well as actions of a global scope requiring cooperation and inputs from regions.

22. United Nations Regional Commissions have an important role to play in Global Programme of Action implementation through, inter alia, provision of their expertise in examining the socio-economic origins of certain processes of contamination and in identifying adequate policy instruments to deal with marine and coastal contamination in the framework of overall development strategies and policies in each region.

23. The coordinated application of a number of other regional environmental conventions will also directly contribute to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

Clearing-house mechanism

24. The draft General Assembly resolution prepared by Governments at CSD called upon UNEP to take expeditious action to provide for the establishment and implementation of the clearing-house mechanism. It also requested the establishment of the inter-organizational group to develop the basic design and structure of the clearing-house data directory and its linkages to information delivery mechanisms. The resolution also specified (and called

upon States to take appropriate action in relevant governing bodies) those United Nations agencies and programmes which are to take the lead in coordinating the development of the clearing-house mechanism with respect to the following pollution source categories:

- sewage - WHO;

- persistent organic pollutants - Inter-organizational Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (UNEP, WHO, FAO, UNIDO, ILO, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)), International Programme on Chemical Safety (UNEP, WHO, ILO) and the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS);

- heavy metals - UNEP in cooperation with the Inter-organizational Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC);

- radioactive substances - IAEA;

- nutrients and sediments mobilization - FAO;

- oils (hydrocarbons) and litter - IMO 2/;

- physical alterations, including habitat modification and destruction of areas of concern - UNEP.

25. The Joint Inter-agency/Intersecretariat Consultation on Implementation of the Global Programme of Action (Geneva, 15-16 May 1996) also discussed the clearing-house mechanism. UNEP's Water Branch will have overall responsibility for setting up the clearing-house, to be undertaken by the Coordination Office, when established. A technical meeting of some of the potential users and agencies is planned to prepare the initial specifications which will be based, as far as possible, on established systems (Geneva, 26-27 September 1996).

26. Existing regional information systems of various organizations will be examined from the point of view of their wider applicability in the mechanism. The meeting will address both the information structure as well as types of software and Internet connections appropriate for the first trial version of the clearing-house. A system of Internet links among agencies in order to be able to provide information needed by Governments is currently being developed.

Assessment of the state of oceans and coastal waters

27. The Global Programme of Action states that, at the global level, there is a need for regular reviews of the state of the world marine environment, and recommended the establishment of linkages among international programmes

---

2/ IMO subsequently indicated that its involvement would be limited to the obligations arising from the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL) 73/78, the London Dumping Convention and other IMO instruments, as appropriate.

involved in monitoring and assessing the state of the marine environment and the relevant rivers system. In this context, the Global Programme of Action identified GESAMP as a body which should undertake scientific assessments of land-based impacts on the marine environment in the context of the implementation of the Global Programme of Action.

28. Based on a UNEP proposal presented to the XXVI session of GESAMP (Paris, 25-29 March 1996), GESAMP established a Working Group on Marine Environmental Assessments, with UNEP as the leading agency, and sponsored by IMO, FAO, UNESCO/IOC, WMO, WHO, IAEA and the United Nations. The terms of reference for this Working Group include undertaking major periodic assessments of the condition of the marine environment and the preparation of a report on land-based sources and activities affecting the quality and uses of the marine, coastal and associated freshwater environment. The Working Group met from 17-18 May 1996 in Geneva, and established its working procedures, including the role to be played by GESAMP's sponsoring agencies in terms of substantive and financial contributions. The Working Group established a subgroup to prepare the report on impacts of land-based sources and activities affecting the quality and uses of the marine coastal and associated freshwater environment. A preliminary workplan was also adopted for the preparation of the state of marine environment report for the year 2002, and a report on impacts of land-based sources and activities, by mid 1998.

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

29. The Washington Conference also stressed the need for cooperation to establish a legally binding instrument for the control of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and the required action to enhance wastewater treatment and management. Action to respond to these demands has been taken by UNEP in cooperation with relevant agencies and, in particular, through the IOMC, the International Programme on Chemical Safety and the IFCS. Prior to the Washington Conference, in its decision 18/32, the UNEP Governing Council had already invited the IOMC to initiate an assessment process on POPs, starting with a list of 12 substances. It further invited the IFCS to make recommendations and provide information to prepare a draft decision concerning international action on POPs, for consideration at the 1997 session of UNEP Governing Council and the World Health Assembly. In October 1995, an ad hoc Working Group on POPs was convened by UNEP on behalf of IOMC and developed a workplan, which was subsequently adopted by the second meeting of the Intersessional Group of IFCS (Canberra, Australia, March 1996). Another IFCS-sponsored meeting was convened in Manila, Philippines, in June 1996 to discuss, inter alia, realistic response strategies, policies and mechanisms for reducing and/or eliminating emissions, discharges and losses of POPs. The meeting has prepared a number of recommendations for submission to the nineteenth session of the UNEP Governing Council (Final Report of the meeting of the IFCS ad hoc Working Group on Persistent Organic Pollutants, IFCS/WG.POP/Report 1) and to the 1997 session of the World Health Assembly on the action required as related to POP's.

30. In dealing with POPs, particular attention will be placed to the existing conventions, or other instruments which are currently under preparation (as for example, the additional protocols to the 1979 ECE Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution) and which will serve as a possible stepping stone for the subsequent global action.

ACC RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UNEP GOVERNING COUNCIL

(a) ACC underscores the importance it attaches to the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities and the Washington Declaration as adopted at the Washington Conference (23 October-3 November 1995). In this regard, it emphasizes the importance of concerted and coordinated action within the United Nations system undertaken with a view to the effective and goal-oriented implementation of the programme. It therefore recommends that the UNEP Governing Council endorse the efforts of involved United Nations system organizations to develop an effective coordination mechanism and invites the UNEP Governing Council to emphasize the need for further strengthening of inter-agency cooperation in this regard.

(b) ACC welcomes the role of UNEP as secretariat of the programme, and its primary role in facilitating the coordination of the required follow-up action as well as its role in the substantive implementation of the programme, and invites the UNEP Governing Council to give due attention to these activities of UNEP when considering its future work programme and the budget for the biennium 1998-1999.

(c) In view of the concerted system-wide effort required in the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, ACC urges the UNEP Governing Council and all relevant intergovernmental bodies to consider the need to allocate sufficient resources for the implementation of the Global Programme of Action. In this respect, ACC highlights the need for relevant intergovernmental bodies and United Nations system organizations to mobilize additional resources for the implementation of this important initiative.

(d) ACC draws the attention of the UNEP Governing Council to the steps already undertaken by the Global Programme of Action secretariat to seek additional funding, particularly for regional-level implementation of the Global Programme of Action, with the Global Environment Facility. At this stage, regional organizations have been requested to prepare relevant proposals for implementation of the Global Programme of Action at the regional level, for consideration for GEF funding. ACC invites the UNEP Governing Council to consider inviting the GEF General Assembly and its Council to give adequate consideration to financing of projects that support the objectives of the Global Programme of Action.

(e) ACC also draws the attention of the UNEP Governing Council to the draft resolution to be considered at the 51st session of the General Assembly on the implementation of the Global Programme of Action, requesting the formal endorsement by each competent international organization of those parts of the Global Programme of Action which are relevant to their mandates and the according of appropriate priority to the implementation of the Global Programme of Action in the work programme of each organization.

(f) ACC further recommends that the Governing Council request the UNEP Executive Director to transmit this report to the governing bodies of those organizations for their information, when considering this matter.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/13
25 October 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda*

POLICY ISSUES

# THE ENVIRONMENTAL SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN AND OTHER ARAB TERRITORIES

## Report of the Executive Director

## Summary

The present report reviews the implementation of Governing Council decision 17/31, of 21 May 1993, and 18/11, of 26 May 1995, by which the Executive Director was requested, inter alia, to update the report on the state of the environment in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories and to provide the necessary technical assistance in Palestinian institutional and self-capacity-building in the field of the environment.

## Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

(a) Welcome the activities which the United Nations Environment Programme is undertaking within the framework of the multilateral working groups of the Middle East peace talks, and request the Executive Director to continue to intensify such support;

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0638 291096 291096

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

(b) Urge the United Nations Environment Programme to take a prominent role in the activities of the United Nations Special Coordinator in the Occupied Territories in order to ensure that environmental concerns are given due priority in all the cooperative programmes under the jurisdiction of his office; and

(c) Request the Executive Director to undertake, within available resources, activities related to the environmental situation in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories in the course of the regular programme of work for 1998-1999.

## A. Activities undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) within the framework of the Middle East multilateral peace process

1. UNEP participates in the activities of the Multilateral Working Group on Water Resources and the Multilateral Working Group on the Environment of the Middle East peace process.

2. Since the last meeting of the Governing Council, the working groups have met twice. The first occasion was 18-22 June 1995, when the meetings of both working groups were clustered into one session, in Amman, Jordan, as an experimental measure and in view of the close interrelationship between water resources and environmental issues.

3. This experiment was judged by the Steering Committee of the Multilateral Talks not to have been a success and, subsequently, the Water Resources Working Group met in Hammamet, Tunisia, from 14 to 16 May 1996, and the Environment Working Group is scheduled to meet in Valencia, Spain, in December 1996.

4. As a result of financial and other constraints, role of UNEP in the peace process has been restricted to providing technical and other advisory services in those programmes of the multilateral working groups where it has been invited to participate as a partner.

5. UNEP held a training course on "Project Design and Appraisal Tools for Integrated Environmental and Economic Assessment" from 4 to 8 December 1995, in Nairobi, Kenya, as part of the water sector regional training programme conducted by the European Union. The training course was attended by 17 participants from the three core parties and from Egypt, Morocco and Oman. Participants requested UNEP to provide more detailed assistance on specific topics in longer workshops, which should be held in the region. A further workshop is being planned for 1997, subject to the availability of resources.

6. UNEP has also provided technical support for the activities of the Norwegian Government in facilitating consensus-building on principles for cooperation among the core parties on water-related matters and new and additional water resources. This initiative began as a comparative study of water laws and water institutions in the Middle East sponsored by the Norwegian Government and is being carried out by the Centre for Environmental Studies and Resource Management (CESAR), Oslo, Norway.

7. UNEP participated in an International Expert Meeting on Water Laws and Water Institutions in the Middle East which took place in Geneva, Switzerland, on 26 and 27 June 1995, organized by CESAR. The Global Resources Information Database (GRID) in Arendal also assisted CESAR in the preparation of a Water Atlas (Water Resources Data for Decision Making in the Middle East, a three-volume, 850 page publication, also available on CD-ROM). The Water Atlas is intended to be a tool for implementing the declaration on principles for cooperation among the core parties on water-related matters and new and additional water resources.

8. Agreement was reached on the declaration in Oslo on 13 February 1996, after two years of intense negotiation. In a ceremony, which took place in Oslo on 12 June 1996 and to which representatives of UNEP were invited, the declaration was made public and an implementation initiative was announced incorporating a "Waternet" - an electronic network connecting public and academic institutions working with water issues in the Middle East. As part of the network, a regional network and research centre is proposed to be established in Amman, Jordan.

9. A further proposal to equip the centre as a UNEPnet Subnet B station with satellite connection to worldwide electronic networking facilities is also under consideration by the core parties.

10. In relation to the Working Group on the Environment, UNEP and the Intergovernmental Committee for the Elaboration of an International Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa are cooperating in the Desertification Programme led by the World Bank through the implementation of a project in the Arava Valley.

### B. Activities associated with the Office of the United Nations Special Coordinator in the Occupied Territories (UNSCO)

11. Following the establishment of an inter-agency consultative mechanism for the improvement of coordination in The United Nations' system support to the peace process in the Middle East, the Office of the Special Coordinator in the Occupied Territories (UNSCO) has held three inter-agency meetings.

12. The main task of the first two meetings was to prepare six strategy papers covering education, employment generation, health, infrastructure and housing, institution building and the private sector for the January 1996 Paris Ministerial Conference on Economic Assistance to the Palestinians.

13. UNEP is involved in the health and infrastructure working groups and also gives general advice on environmental aspects of sustainable development.

14. Since the publication of the six United Nations strategy papers, over US$ 110 million has been committed by donors towards United Nations projects.

15. UNSCO is now preparing a similar initiative for 1997 and UNEP has prepared two project proposals for possible financing. One is on training in environmental law and the other is in environmental economics. The proposals for 1997 will be presented to a World Bank consultative meeting in late 1996.

## C. The environmental situation

16. With regard to the request to the Executive Director to update the report on the environmental situation in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, contained in decision 18/11 of 26 May 1996, the additional financial resources required to produce this report and to provide technical assistance to the Palestinian National Authority have not yet been obtained.

17. Nevertheless, specific environmental assessment activities were undertaken under the auspices of bilateral projects:

(a) The Gaza Environmental Profile has been completed by the Palestinian National Authority with financial assistance from the Government of the Netherlands. Plans are underway to complete a similar environmental profile of the West Bank, following the establishment of an office of the Environmental Planning Directorate in the West Bank.

(b) The Government of Israel has published a report on regional environmental cooperation and development options, which contains information on many of the major environmental problems facing the Middle East, such as rapid development, population and urban growth; water shortages; desertification; pollution; and the conservation of biological diversity.1/

(c) Since 1994, the Austrian Government Department for Development Cooperation has supported the establishment of an environmental database for the West Bank at the Applied Research Institute, Jerusalem. The implementing agency is the Society for Austro-Arab Relations. The database covers agriculture, water, climate, industry, wastewater and solid waste and are contained in a geographic information system (GIS).

## D. Technical assistance in Palestinian institutional and self-capacity-building

18. In view of the lack of additional resources to comply fully with decision 18/11 of the Governing Council and the relevant parts of decision 17/31 of the Governing Council relating to technical assistance, UNEP has concentrated on ensuring that environmental considerations are taken into account in the United Nations system programme of assistance to the Palestinians covered under the UNSCO coordinated activities in the six priority areas mentioned in paragraph 12 above.

---

1/ Regional Environmental Cooperation and Development Option, Government of Israel, Ministry of the Environment, January 1996.

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/14
1 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

PROGRAMME MATTERS

# Improvement of the international response to environmental emergencies

## Report of the Executive Director

## Summary

The present report is submitted in accordance with Governing Council decision 18/19 of 26 May 1995 which requested the Executive Director, inter alia, to prepare a detailed progress report on the activities of the Joint United Nations Environment Programme/Department of Humanitarian Affairs Environment Unit. During 1995-1996, the Joint Unit improved the delivery of international assistance to Governments facing environmental emergencies. It assisted many countries, particularly developing countries, using the specific mechanisms, tools and capabilities it has developed. The Joint Unit acts as a broker between affected and donor countries, by operating an information clearing-house and acting as a focal point for disaster notification and alert. The initial phase of this joint initiative has demonstrated that the integration of experience and expertise between the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Department of Humanitarian Affairs (DHA) is a practical approach that makes the best use of limited resources. It provides a targeted and efficient structure, and fills identified gaps in the international coverage of environmental-emergency response, without duplicating the response of other organizations. Countries may now call on a practical, stand-by system, capable of a round-the-clock response, to mobilize international assistance in the case of environmental emergencies.

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0703 141196

141196

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

## Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

1. Take note of the report of the Executive Director on progress in implementing decision 18/19;

2. Express its satisfaction with the continued collaboration between the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Department of Humanitarian Affairs in enhancing the ability of the United Nations to respond to environmental emergencies;

3. Invite Governments and relevant United Nations organizations and specialized agencies to continue to cooperate with the Joint Unit in its efforts to provide assistance to countries, in particular developing countries, facing environmental emergencies;

4. Request the Joint United Nations Environment Programme/Department of Humanitarian Affairs Environment Unit to develop further its activities in accordance with recommendations of the Advisory Group on Environmental Emergencies;

5. Urge Governments and international organizations, in a position to do so, to contribute to the Trust Fund for Environmental Emergencies.

## INTRODUCTION

1. The Joint UNEP/DHA Environment Unit was set up in 1994, following extensive consultations with Governments. The latter expressed strong support for a simple mechanism within the United Nations to ensure prompt delivery of international assistance and offer a single entry point to the United Nations system in the case of environmental emergencies. The Joint Unit has been mandated to improve the international response to environmental emergencies by acting as a broker between affected and donor countries, a clearing-house for information and a switchboard for disaster notification and alert. This integrated United Nations response capacity of UNEP and DHA is catalysing international assistance to countries facing environmental emergencies such as chemical and oil spills, industrial accidents, forest fires and other sudden-onset emergencies that cause, or threaten, environmental damage and can have serious impacts on human health and welfare. The Joint Unit is accessible for urgent assistance 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

2. The operational costs of the Joint Unit, including staff, communications, travel and office equipment, are covered by UNEP. DHA is providing the Unit with necessary support and backstopping, including office space and emergency-response facilities. The Joint Unit is organizationally fully integrated in DHA's Relief Coordination Branch and carries out its activities in conformity with services traditionally provided by that Branch, including arrangements for independent assessment of emergencies.

3. UNEP and DHA have set up an open-ended international Advisory Group on Environmental Emergencies to bring together national experts and focal points from countries around the world. The Advisory Group meets annually to share experience in the field of response to environmental disasters, review the work of the Joint Unit, and provide advice and guidance on its future activities. The second meeting of the Advisory Group was held in October 1996. The activities and services of the Joint Unit are being developed taking fully into account the recommendations of the Advisory Group.

4. Since the Joint Unit is operating under difficult financial conditions and with minimal staff, the Russian Federation recommended the establishment of a Trust Fund for Environmental Emergencies to increase the Unit's ability to respond quickly to environmental emergencies and made an initial pledge of $10,000.

## I. ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE JOINT UNEP/DHA ENVIRONMENT UNIT

5. UNEP and DHA continued consolidating humanitarian and environmental assistance to countries facing environmental emergencies. To improve the delivery of environmental-emergency assistance to Governments, the Joint Unit has been further developing core-response services, including brokerage and information clearing-house functions, and the facilitation of initial assessment and post-emergency analysis. It has also implemented a number of support activities.

6. The Joint Unit has developed a global network of officially-designated National Focal Points (NFPs), which functions as a conduit for information

and assistance. Operating through this network, the unit is able to maintain efficient links between both potential recipient and donor countries, so that requests for assistance can be brokered with minimum delays. This global network has been considerably expanded and covers, at present, almost one hundred countries in all major regions.

7. An open-ended roster of environmental stand-by experts from different countries has been established. These experts are called upon for the provision of urgent professional advice and/or participation in specific field missions to assess emergency situations. A number of stand-by experts have already participated in various missions. The financial contributions and provision of expertise by some donor countries have allowed the Joint Unit to provide effective assistance and services with a very small in-house team.

8. Swift preparation and wide distribution of standard information and situation reports among relevant actors has allowed the establishment of a flow of information on disasters and their environmental consequences. To improve emergency-reporting procedures, a standard notification/request form for assistance has been prepared and disseminated, on a trial basis, among National Focal Points and UNDP Resident Representatives in all countries. The development of such a procedure for environmental emergencies is used to strengthen the links between potentially affected countries, the Joint Unit and potential donors, by facilitating the rapid flow of essential information. The form has been already used in several emergency situations. Draft guidelines and a questionnaire for environmental assessment following chemical emergencies have also been elaborated. This emergency-assessment tool aims at assisting competent national authorities and/or international experts to gather the necessary data on-site, for onwards transmission to the Joint Unit.

9. The Joint Unit has increased collaboration with other UNEP units and programmes dealing with prevention and preparedness aspects of environmental emergencies. Draft guidelines for the development of a National Environmental Contingency Plan have been prepared in cooperation with UNEP Industry and Environment Programme Activity Centre (IE/PAC). The purpose of these guidelines is to assist countries in formulating such plans at the national level. In addition, the Joint Unit, in collaboration with the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and IE/PAC, initiated the updating of the 1991 International Directory of Emergency Response Centres.

10. Since its establishment, the Joint Unit has assisted many countries in responding to a variety of environmental emergencies by using the mechanisms, tools and capabilities it developed. Among these countries are Turkey, Albania, Ecuador, Montenegro, Djibouti, Barbados, Chile, Mozambique and Romania. In 1995-1996, the Joint Unit responded to requests for assistance from, among other countries, Ukraine (major sewerage system collapse), Guyana (mining waste dam failure), the Seychelles (main sewerage system breakdown), Rwanda (fungicide storage fire), Slovenia (chemical-waste dumping-site fire), the Philippines (spill of copper mine tailings), and the Russian Federation (oil-waste fire). These responses were adapted to meet the specific situations of the country requesting assistance.

11. Practical experience in implementing this joint initiative has clearly demonstrated the appropriateness of the Joint Unit's location in Geneva, where it is fully integrated in DHA's Relief Coordination Branch in Geneva and relies on the emergency-response facilities of the Relief Coordination Branch, particularly its modern Operations Centre.

## II. REVIEW OF THE JOINT UNIT BY THE ADVISORY GROUP ON ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCIES

12. The second meeting of the Advisory Group on Environmental Emergencies was held in Geneva on 3-4 October 1996. It reviewed the implementation of the Joint Unit's activities, which is operating with extremely limited financial resources and with minimal staff. The Advisory Group also considered proposals for further improvement of emergency assistance to Governments in 1997-1999. The Advisory Group expressed its satisfaction with the continued collaboration between UNEP and DHA. It also expressed its satisfaction with the development of cooperation with relevant United Nations agencies and UNEP units, particularly UNEP's chemicals programme and UNEP's IE/PAC's Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies at Local Level (APELL) programme.

13. The Advisory Group was briefed on emergency situations where the Joint Unit has assisted countries; in particular it was informed of the important United Nations expert assessment mission to the Philippines, which helped the national authorities to evaluate the consequences of a large-scale spill of mining tailings in March 1996. The Group recognized that the Joint Unit has provided valuable impartial information with regard to a number of environmental emergencies and recommended that the flow of information on environmental emergencies be further improved.

14. The Advisory Group was informed that, due to an unprecedented financial crisis, UNEP has only be able to allocate the minimum funds to keep one Professional staff member and one secretary in the Joint Unit and will not be in a position to provide financial resources for the activities of the Joint Unit in 1997. The Advisory Group fully recognized the difficult financial situation and discussed various possibilities for additional support to the Joint Unit, including cash contributions, secondment of Professional staff members, execution of specific project proposals in countries, nomination of national experts for United Nations assessment missions, and having the costs of meetings of the Advisory Group borne by different countries. The Advisory Group asked the Executive Director of UNEP to allocate the necessary resources for the biennium 1998-1999 for the administration and operation of the Joint Unit and recommended to Governments in a position to do so to provide additional resources.

15. The Advisory Group also requested the Joint Unit to develop further its activities and services, especially brokerage, clearing-house and assessment, in conformity with standard operational procedures of DHA's Relief Coordination Branch.

16. Since the major elements of the response system established by the Joint Unit require permanent maintenance and further improvement, the Joint Unit will strive to consolidate and strengthen the international capacity to

respond to environmental emergencies. It will also continue to focus on assistance to countries facing environmental emergencies, taking fully into account recommendations of the Advisory Group on Environmental Emergencies.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/15
13 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 7 of the provisional agenda*

THE ENVIRONMENT FUND AND ADMINISTRATIVE
AND OTHER BUDGETARY MATTERS

# Enhancing human resource utilization within the United Nations Environment Programme while ensuring the complementary and appropriate use of individual and corporate consultancies

## Report of the Executive Director

Summary

At its eighteenth session, the Governing Council adopted decision 18/48 seeking to ensure that human resources within the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) could effectively meet functional demands. At the same session, the Governing Council adopted decision 18/49 noting with concern the financial burden that had previously been incurred through expenditure on individual and corporate consultancies. Pursuant to those decisions, the present report summarizes efforts taken by UNEP to enhance the quality of human resources and human resource management within the organization.

## Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to take note of the present report of the Executive Director.

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0733 221196

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

## I. EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF EXPERTISE IN UNEP

1. UNEP engages in an ongoing programme of staff training, subject to the availability of funds, through the comprehensive services provided by the Human Resource Management Service (HRMS) of the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON). At the broadest level, courses that teach, as well as review, a range of office automation skills are available for all staff members. Similarly, staff members may receive language tuition in all official United Nations languages where appropriate. More specific training is available for senior-level staff to fully exploit management information systems as well as project development techniques. In addition, UNON HRMS administers United Nations system-wide proficiency tests such as the competitive examination for promotion of staff from the General Service and other categories to the Professional category.

2. In order to ensure the recruitment of the highest-quality staff, vacancy announcements are circulated to all Permanent Representatives, UNEP's regional and outposted offices, as well as other United Nations organizations. Vacancies are also advertized within the organization according to the United Nations guidelines. In addition, copies of the announcements are provided to programme managers for distribution to institutions that may concentrate in the area of expertise specifically required. Occasionally, when circumstances warrant, newspaper or journal advertizing is employed.

3. At its eighteenth session, the Governing Council requested, in its decision 18/48, that new approaches to improving the level of skills and knowledge within the organization should be examined. In this light, the possibility of establishing a formal staff rotational policy has been analysed. While such a policy may have some merit in helping maintain an up-to-date institutional awareness of contemporary scientific developments, the cost of recruiting, transferring and repatriating staff with such a level of frequency would be prohibitive for UNEP and would lead to severe constraints on project expenditure. However, to a considerable extent staff rotation already takes place within the organization. The natural level of staff turnover means that approximately 10 per cent of the staff have been newly recruited every year. In addition, there already exists some rotation of staff within the organization, both between different organizational units and also from headquarters to outposted and regional offices as well as convention secretariats. For the biennium 1994-1995, approximately 10 per cent of staff were rotated between positions within the various offices administered under the auspices of UNEP. In sum, existing rotational mechanisms have enabled staff members with specific skills to transfer to programme areas that more effectively utilize their expertise in line with evolving programme priorities. UNEP is fully aware of the potential benefits of rotating staff and supports staff rotation where beneficial to the work of subprogramme units.

4. Skills and knowledge within UNEP are also augmented by the valuable contribution of Junior Professional Officers who introduce technical abilities and research awareness from the leading edge of the environmental debate. In a similar vein, the establishment of a structured internship programme exposes UNEP to the latest developments from within scientific and academic institutions. Furthermore, UNEP's institutional expertise across

the various subprogramme elements is supplemented and expanded through participation in global, regional and subregional information networks.

## II. POLICY GUIDELINES FOR SELECTING CONSULTANTS

5. Existing staff resources are supplemented as required through consultancy services. As requested by Governing Council decision 18/49, an Executive Directive1/ has been issued to all staff emphasizing the principles to be taken into account in selecting consultants. During the 1996-1997 biennium, UNEP has implemented several procedures designed to ensure that consultancies are awarded only where appropriate. The guidelines and the resulting developments are outlined in paragraphs 6 - 11 below.

6. Consultancies should be awarded on the basis of expertise and value for money. In the light of this instruction and in response to the financial crisis currently facing UNEP, the Office of the Executive Director now reviews and gives final approval to all proposed consultancies. This procedure augments the existing clear guidelines that have governed the decision-making of programme managers in the past and is designed to underline the current need for recruiting only the highest-quality consultants as well as ensuring that economy measures are implemented as far as possible by limiting consultancies to those programme areas with the highest priority.

7. The number of consultancies as well as the cost of each consultancy should be kept to a minimum. Since 1993 the number of consultancies that are financed from the Environment Fund and that exceed a duration of one month have decreased annually by approximately 17 per cent. This trend has continued in the current biennium as the number of consultancies are reduced due to budgetary constraints and higher quality-control standards. Furthermore, the total expenditure on consultancies has fallen at a rate of approximately 21 per cent a year since 1993. As a result, the average expenditure per consultancy is decreasing.

8. In accordance with the appropriate United Nations Administrative Instructions, consultancies should only be awarded when it is clearly established that the appropriate expertise is not available in-house. This principle is further underpinned by the review of all proposed consultancies by the Office of the Executive Director.

9. Consultancies should demonstrably contribute to UNEP's approved programme of work. Programme managers have therefore been advised that the purpose of consultancies must closely reflect the outputs requested and approved under the appropriate Governing Council decisions.

10. Consultancies should be selected with due consideration to geographical and gender balance. Programme managers have been advised to carefully consider potential consultants from developing countries and countries with economies in transition when making selections. In addition, UNON HRMS has fully updated and computerized the roster of consultants with specific

---

1/ UNEP/ED/1996/4 of 5 March 1996.

attention to expanding the geographic spread of listed candidates. Simultaneously, the roster has been redefined in consultation with UNEP programme managers and is now more responsive to the substantive and programmatic needs of the organization. As a result of these developments the geographical base from which consultants are recruited has expanded. In 1993, 45 per cent of consultants were recruited from countries not members of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). By 1995, 54 per cent of consultants were recruited from non-OECD countries and this trend continues to be encouraged. Programme managers are also advised to take due consideration of gender when selecting candidates with a view to improving the gender balance of consultancies, in line with United Nations guidelines.

11. No one country should provide a disproportionate share of consultants. As reflected in the above statistics, programme managers are encouraged to consider candidates for consultancies from all countries. In 1993, one country provided 19 per cent of consultancies. By 1995, the maximum share for any one country was 16 per cent. Efforts are also under way to ensure that consultancies are equitably distributed by geographical region.

## III. REPORTING TO THE COMMITTEE OF PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES ON CONSULTANCIES

12. In accordance with Governing Council decisions 18/42 and 18/49, the Executive Director continues to report on the status of consultancies on a quarterly basis to the Committee of Permanent Representatives. The regular reports include details of the cost and purpose of consultancies awarded, length of consultancies and geographical distribution of consultants.

13. In addition, a statement has been prepared for the Committee of Permanent Representatives outlining the procedures to be followed in identifying the need for consultancies, selecting consultancies and assessing the duties that had been performed.

## III. EVALUATION OF CONSULTANCIES

14. Programme managers are required to complete the evaluation section of the Special Service Agreement (SSA) for each consultancy. The purpose of the evaluation is to grade the quality of the work performed and provide a recommendation as to whether the consultant should be considered for future employment. In view of the need to ensure quality and implement economy measures, it is particularly important that consultancies are carefully evaluated and monitored.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL
UNEP/GC.19/16
1 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4(c) of the provisional agenda*

POLICY ISSUES: COORDINATION AND COOPERATION WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS, INCLUDING NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

# Participation of the United Nations Environment Programme in the work of the Global Environment Facility (GEF)

## Report of the Executive Director

## Summary

Following Governing Council's adoption of the Instrument for the Establishment of Restructured Global Environment Facility (UNEP/GCSS.IV/2, annex), and pursuant to Governing Council's instruction that the Executive Director take action to enhance UNEP's capacity to fulfil its role and mandate in GEF, the Executive Director has taken the steps outlined in this document to strengthen UNEP's participation in the GEF process. These include staffing of the GEF Coordination Unit; placing the Unit under the direct supervision of the Office of the Executive Director; and implementation of operational procedures to ensure the mainstreaming of GEF activities in the work of UNEP.

## Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

1. Note the progress made to date by the Executive Director to strengthen the capacity of UNEP to fulfil its designated role in GEF;

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0709 141196 141196

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

2. Authorize the Executive Director to take such additional actions as are deemed necessary to further strengthen the capacity of UNEP to fulfil its designated role in the GEF.

3. Reaffirm the commitment of the Governing Council to the full involvement of UNEP in the design and implementation of GEF programmes and projects.

4. Urge the Executive Director to continue to strengthen the linkages between UNEP and the GEF.

## INTRODUCTION

1. In decision SS.IV/1, the Governing Council adopted the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility (GEF) and requested the Executive Director to enhance the capacity of UNEP to fulfil its role as one of the GEF Implementing Agencies. At its eighteenth session, the Governing Council considered the report of the Executive Director on the participation of UNEP in the GEF (UNEP/GC.18/20).

2. Under annex D, paragraph 11, of the Instrument, UNEP is assigned the primary role in: catalysing the development of scientific and technical analyses, and in advancing environmental management in GEF-financed activities; providing guidance on relating the GEF-financed activities to global, regional and national environmental assessments, policy frameworks and plans, and to international agreements; and is responsible for establishing and supporting the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) as an advisory body to the GEF.

3. In the course of the GEF Heads of Agencies meeting, held in Washington, D.C., on 19 June 1996, UNEP's priorities as an Implementing Agency were listed by the Executive Director as: (i) assessments along the lines of the "Global Assessment of Biodiversity"; (ii) backstopping the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel; (iii) regional efforts, in collaboration with the other Implementing Agencies, on transboundary issues in the international waters and biodiversity focal areas; and (iv) "enabling activities" to assist countries in preparing their action plans and strategies for implementing the global environmental conventions.

## I. CONTRIBUTION OF UNEP TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF GEF POLICIES AND OPERATIONS

4. At its October 1995 meeting, the GEF Council approved the Operational Strategy for the GEF. UNEP has provided technical and scientific inputs in the preparation of the Strategy and has taken the lead in preparing a possible GEF strategy on research. GEF operations are to be programmed in three categories of activity: (i) enabling activities; (ii) operational programmes; and (iii) short-term response measures.

5. Enabling activities include inventories, compilation of information, policy analysis, and strategies and actions plans and represent the basic building-block of GEF assistance. UNEP participated in two inter-agency task forces, on biological diversity and climate change, established to prepare the operational criteria as well as to coordinate and implement approved enabling activities. UNEP is taking an active part in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of such enabling activities. In April 1996, the GEF Council agreed that it would advantageous to develop inter-country training and best-practice workshops, at a regional or global level, and it has been agreed that UNEP will take the lead in developing this effort.

6. UNEP has contributed to the development of the 10 GEF Operational Programmes which provide conceptual and planning frameworks for the design, implementation and coordination of global environmental projects. UNEP is also involved in ongoing efforts aimed at encouraging broad participation in

GEF operations, by increasing public involvement, engaging the private sector and enhancing the participation of non-governmental organizations. These efforts have included contributions to the drafting of policy documents considered by the Council, and the convening of a consultative meeting between accredited NGOs and UNEP on 8-9 May 1996, and a meeting with representatives of indigenous and local communities from 29 to 31 May 1996. UNEP is cooperating with UNDP and the World Bank in the implementation of GEF Project Development Workshops aimed at enhancing the capacity of an ever-widening range of GEF stakeholders to identify, develop and manage well-designed, high-quality, country-driven GEF-eligible projects.

7. UNEP is closely associated with the on-going efforts of the GEF secretariat aimed at improving operational and managerial effectiveness that include: (i) developing procedures for operational programming; (ii) estimation and application of incremental costs; (iii) monitoring and evaluation; (iv) streamlining the procedure of the GEF Operations Committee (GEFOP); and (v) the application of the logical framework approach. Regarding the latter, a workshop for all UNEP staff on the logical framework approach was convened in Nairobi on 2-3 September 1996.

8. The increased contribution of UNEP in the GEF operations as a result of the measures taken by the Executive Director is also reflected in the increased involvement of UNEP as an Implementing Agency and in the UNEP/GEF Business Plan for Fiscal Year 1997-1999 considered by the GEF Council in October 1995.

## II. UNEP/GEF BUSINESS PLAN FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997-1999

9. At its May 1995 meeting, the GEF Council adopted a corporate business planning/budgeting approach involving a three-year business planning cycle and an annual budget. Three-year rolling business plans are to be presented in October/November of each calendar year with a corresponding detailed corporate budget to be presented for Council review and approval at the first meeting of the following year (April/May). UNEP's GEF business plan for fiscal year 1997-1999 submitted to the GEF is based on the assumptions detailed in paragraphs 10-15 below.

10. UNEP as an Implementing Agency. UNEP will implement through a wide variety of executing agencies, a small number of projects that build on the existing UNEP programme. To the extent possible and necessary for effective implementation, projects will be implemented jointly with other Implementing Agencies.

11. UNEP as a source of new project ideas. Through its own networks, UNEP will support the GEF objective of "casting as wide a net as possible" by assisting countries in identifying project concepts. Within its area of expertise and as part of its role in coordinating the environmental activities of United Nations bodies, UNEP will also seek to encourage the participation of agencies of the United Nations system, the scientific community and the private sector in GEF activities.

12. UNEP as a source of guidance on relating GEF-financed activities to global, regional, and national environmental assessments, policy frameworks

and action plans, and international agreements. UNEP will review and offer inputs on the design of UNDP and World Bank projects by advising on the consistency of the projects with global and regional agreements, assessments and programmes, as well as on opportunities for stronger links with them.

13. UNEP as a partner of UNDP and the World Bank in project development and implementation. Significant emphasis will be placed on effective collaboration with, and support to, UNDP and the World Bank in the development of the GEF-1 portfolio. UNEP will promote inter-agency synergy in GEF projects and maximize the benefits projects may derive from UNEP's comparative advantage.

14. UNEP's role at the strategic level. In cooperation with the GEF secretariat and the other Implementing Agencies, UNEP will help identify priorities and gaps in GEF operational strategies and work to further refine and develop GEF policies and strategies. UNEP inputs to GEF strategy, are central to its responsibility to relate GEF-financed activities to environmental assessments, policy frameworks and agreements.

15. UNEP's role in GEF programming and awareness. UNEP will participate in and organize activities (particularly at the regional level), in collaboration with the GEF secretariat and other Implementing Agencies, to increase awareness about the GEF, and to further develop the work programme in the focal areas and cross-cutting issues such as land degradation.

## III. SUPPORTING THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL

16. Paragraph 24 of the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured GEF states that:

> "UNEP shall establish, in consultation with UNDP and the World Bank and on the basis of guidelines and criteria established by the Council, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) as an advisory body to the Facility. UNEP shall provide the STAP's Secretariat and shall operate as the liaison between the Facility and the STAP".

At the initiative of UNEP, the July 1995 meeting of the Council adopted terms of reference, a mandate, composition and role for the STAP.

24. The mandate of STAP is to provide objective, strategic and technical advice on GEF policies, operational strategies and programmes; conduct selective reviews of projects in certain circumstances and at specific points in the project cycle; and to maintain a roster of experts. STAP's activities are to be integrated with the activities of the GEF secretariat and Implementing Agencies.

28. In early February 1995, The Executive Director appointed, in consultation with the GEF Implementing Agencies, a reconstituted STAP of 12 members, from developing and developed countries, four of whom are women.

29. As part of its strategic role, STAP is expected to provide specific products on a regular basis and in accordance with this mandate, STAP has

delivered a number of products including: the roster of experts and operational guidelines on the management of the roster; review of issues emerging from the Operational Strategy and Operational Programmes; and technical and scientific analyses as well as thematic papers in the focal areas of biodiversity, climate change, international waters and land degradation.

30. STAP has provided technical and scientific advice on the projects submitted by the Implementing Agencies to the GEF Operations Committee, and has convened two workshops one on stimulating private sector initiatives for accelerating the introduction of renewable energy technologies and one on land degradation. It has also convened brainstorming sessions with the coordinators of the focal areas of the Implementing Agencies and the GEF secretariat and initiated selected review of GEF projects.

## IV. CONCLUSION

31. It is anticipated that as a consequence of the strengthening of the GEF Coordination Unit, UNEP's active involvement, at all levels of the GEF process, will be enhanced during the next biennium.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/17
20 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PRIN

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (c) of the provisional agenda*

POLICY ISSUES: COORDINATION AND COOPERATION WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS, INCLUDING NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

# Inter-Agency Environment Coordination Group (IAEG)

## Note by the Executive Director

## Summary

Prepared in accordance with Governing Council decision 18/14, the present note briefly describes the activities of the Inter-Agency Environment Coordination Group (IAEG) since the last session of the Council, the progress achieved in its work and the broad conclusions of its meetings.

## Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

1. Take note of the present report of the Executive Director on the work of the Inter-Agency Environment Coordination Group (IAEG);

2. Request the Executive Director to report to the Governing Council at its twentieth session on the progress made in the work of the Inter-Agency Environment Coordination Group, including the further refinement and focusing of its role and functioning, while taking into account recommendations of the special session of the General Assembly on the review of the implementation of Agenda 21.

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0726 201196 201196

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

INTER AGENCY ENVIRONMENT COORDINATION GROUP (IAEG)

1. Pursuant to Governing Council decision 18/14, the present report outlines developments relating to the functioning of the Inter-Agency Environment Coordination Group (IAEG). In that decision, the Governing Council:

(a) Welcomed the establishment of IAEG as a flexible consultative and advisory body;

(b) Decided that IAEG should focus on assisting the Executive Director in coordinating the activities of the United Nations system in addressing the major challenges, as set out in the programme of work for the biennium 1996-1997;

(c) Stressed that, in determining the terms of reference and future activities of the Group, full account should be taken of role, responsibilities and work of the Inter-Agency Committee on Sustainable Development; and

(d) Requested the Executive Director to report at its nineteenth session on the terms of reference, progress made in the work of IAEG and proposed future activities.

2. In 1996, IAEG held an informal meeting in New York on 25 April 1996, in conjunction with the fourth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development. An open exchange of views took place on the selection of a topic for the report of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC) to UNEP Governing Council, the preparation of a system-wide strategy document in the field of the environment and the role and functioning of IAEG, on the basis of proposals by the UNEP secretariat. Subsequently, IAEG held a second meeting, in New York on 9 July 1996, to formalize a number of coordination matters in preparation for the nineteenth session of the Governing Council.

3. At that meeting, IAEG decided that the topic for the ACC report should be the implementation of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities and agreed on an approach and modalities for its preparation. The report, as endorsed by ACC, is being circulated as an official document of the Council at its nineteenth session (UNEP/GC.19/12). The attention of the Council is drawn in particular to the recommendations of ACC (UNEP/GC.19/12, page 9).

4. IAEG also discussed and made proposals for the preparation of the draft system-wide strategy in the field of the environment. It was generally felt that the strategy should be structured in light of the UNEP work programme and should form the basis for cooperation on environmental matters between UNEP and other organizations in the United Nations system. At its nineteenth session, the Council will have before it a note by the Executive Director on the strategy (UNEP/GC.19/19), while the strategy itself will be circulated as an information document.

5. The future work and terms of reference of IAEG were discussed at both meetings. The consensus among IAEG members was that a formalization of the terms of reference and agreement on the future functioning of IAEG should

await the outcome of the special session of the General Assembly on the review of the implementation of Agenda 21, to be held in June 1997. It was felt that the special session would have implications of an institutional nature, including inter-agency coordination, and that the functioning of IAEG would have to be addressed subsequently in that context.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

Governing Council
of the United Nations
Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/18
12 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 7 of the provisional agenda*

THE ENVIRONMENT FUND AND ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER BUDGETARY MATTERS

The cost of administering trust funds

Report of the Executive Director


Summary

Prepared in response to Governing Council decision 18/44 B, paragraph 3, the present report contains an interim analysis of the cost to UNEP of administering trust funds and, in particular, of whether that cost is covered by the 13 per cent administrative support charge levied on trust fund expenditures. This interim analysis indicates that the support charge effectively supports the administrative burden trust funds create and is also broadly sufficient to cover the administrative costs of additional counterpart contributions that are accepted as earmarked contributions in support of specific trust fund activities. The interim analysis also supports the initial conclusion that the administration of UNEP's current trust fund workload does not exert a significant drain on Environment Fund resources. However, there are suggestions that a more definitive analysis may actually indicate that the administrative burden created by trust funds may be slightly heavier than can currently be calculated under the present methodology. The report proposes that the current arrangements are maintained while being kept under review.


Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

1. Take note of the present report of the Executive Director on the cost of administering trust funds;

2. Request the Executive Director to keep the issue under review and to report to the Governing Council at its twentieth session on developments regarding the costs to UNEP of the administration of trust funds and related earmarked contributions.

* UNEP/GC.19/1.


Na.96-0771 271196

271196



For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

## INTRODUCTION

1. By its decision 18/44 B, paragraph 3, the Governing Council requested the Executive Director to undertake a cost-management study of expenditure on administering trust funds, of resource shortfalls and of possible ways to overcome such a shortfall, if any, and to report thereon to the nineteenth session. The present report has been prepared in response to that request.

## I. DEFINING THE ADMINISTRATIVE WORKLOAD GENERATED BY TRUST FUND ACTIVITIES

2. When UNEP is charged with administering a trust fund, it is responsible for, inter alia, implementing recruitment procedures, arranging for the payment of salaries and allowances of all staff paid from the trust fund, administering contracts for staff, consultants and supplies, ensuring adherence to the established rules for contracting of supplies and equipment, administering travel, accounting and reporting of income and expenditures, collecting and recording contributions to the fund, and for all correspondence relating thereto. It is responsible also for the preparation and revision of project documents and for the control of financial allotments within available resources, for the control of expenditures within approved allotments and for the control of staffing within approved staffing regulations.

3. Since most of the above tasks are clearly the same as those undertaken for UNEP programmes in general, there is no functional division of administrative units within UNEP and United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) between those that work on the Fund programme and those that work on trust fund activities. While theoretically possible, such a division would be duplicative and would involve an inefficient use of human resources, which would lead to yet higher costs. It may also be theoretically possible to set up a system of time-accounting specifically to record and cost hours of work relating to trust funds. Once again, however, the establishing, monitoring and reporting on such a division of staff-time would create prohibitive additional costs and an even higher administrative burden. This would be particularly hard to justify in a time of severe financial constraints across the programme.

4. Additionally, it is clear that a large proportion of the tasks listed in paragraph 2 above must be performed by administrative offices such as finance, human resource management, and conference and general services, which, following Governing Council decision 18/43, were transferred from UNEP to the newly established UNON on 1 January 1996. Since that time, there has necessarily been a period of reorganization as the new UNON services accommodate the work of other United Nations agencies in Nairobi as well as that of UNEP. This ongoing administrative reorganization has meant that it has not been feasible to give an accurate and up-to-date analysis of the proportion of work undertaken in administrative services with regard to UNEP trust fund activities. With these problems in mind, the following interim analysis has been compiled incorporating the best information currently available, using statistics for the biennium 1994-1995.

## II. METHODOLOGICAL OUTLINE FOR ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM ESTIMATE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT CHARGE

5. Under the current approved format of the United Nations accounts, with which UNEP complies, there is no direct way of separating the costs of administering trust-fund expenditures from those of other funds. In view of this constraint a methodology has been established to assess whether the current level of the 13 per cent administrative support charge effectively covers all necessary administrative costs incurred under trust fund activities. 1/

6. The methodology involves first establishing the "general overheads" 2/ of all UNEP programmes by source of funding. Next, UNEP's total income to cover administrative costs, as outlined in paragraph 7 below, are broken down against each source of funding. Then, the percentage expenditure on "general overheads" generated by trust-fund programmes is compared against the percentage contribution from trust-fund programmes to UNEP's total administrative costs. If the percentage contribution from trust-fund programmes to administrative costs is similar to the percentage expenditure on "general overheads", it may be assumed that the 13 per cent administrative overhead charge on trust funds generates sufficient resources to administer the "general overheads" that they create.

7. The administrative costs of managing these "general overheads" (see paragraph 2 above) are defined as the costs of services such as project management, personnel, finance, procurement and general administrative support, as financed from the regular budget, Environment Fund budgets, the trust fund and administrative support budget and contributions to administration financed by the GEF and counterpart contributions. It must, however, be noted that this interim analysis faces two significant problems in fully defining administrative costs. First, these calculations do not include any part of the cost of programme officers who may from time to time assist in the management of trust fund projects, nor do these figures include any costs of senior management in UNEP concerned with trust funds and related activities. Secondly, the cost of project-management work undertaken by the Fund Programme Management Branch has been excluded from this interim analysis because there is no objective means through the present UNEP accounting system for measuring the amount of work undertaken for projects financed by each source of funds. For these reasons, it would be fair to expect that the current interim analysis underestimates administrative costs incurred by trust-fund programmes.

---

1/ In this interim analysis statistics have not been included on the Trust Fund for the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer with the exception of the secretariat costs.

2/ The "general overheads" of separate programmes under each source of funding are defined as the total costs of staff, consultants, travel and meetings charged to each fund.

8. The contributions of the regular budget and the Environment Fund to administrative costs are provided to support environmental activities of UNEP, while a separate account for administrative support to trust funds (the 13 per cent administrative support charge) is provided to support the activities of trust funds. If a comparison is made of the shares of contributions to cover administrative costs against the shares of the "general overheads", the following picture emerges:

| | General overheads (%) | Contributions (%) to costs of administration |
|---|---|---|
| Environment Fund | 63.1 | 64.8 |
| Conventions trust funds | 18.6 | 17.6 |
| Other trust funds | 11.8 | 15.1 |
| GEF | 6.5 | 2.5 |
| | **100.0** | **100.0** |

9. While allowing for the lack of precision in the estimates, this comparison provides a prima facie indication that the trust funds as a whole, excluding the GEF, contribute slightly more than the share of the "general overheads" that they create. However, if convention trust funds are taken separately then they contributed slightly less to administrative costs than their share of the "general overheads". This may be basically attributable to the greater use of earmarked counterpart contributions for Convention activities. Up to now, these counterpart expenditures have not been charged the 13 per cent administrative support deduction. In view of this, the administrative support charge on regular trust fund contributions has effectively been used to subsidise the administrative costs involved in supporting activities funded by counterpart contributions.

10. These conclusions suggest that the current 13 per cent administrative support charge imposed on trust-fund expenditures is at present broadly sufficient to cover the related administrative costs.

11. A word of caution is, however, called for on this conclusion. A separate attempt was made to measure the administrative costs involved in the management of trust funds by an ex post facto assessment of the work time used by project management, personnel and finance sections. This assessment suggested that the measurement of administrative costs of work related to trust-fund activities used above may have understated the actual work required for trust funds. Whereas staff in the Human Resource Management Service (HRMS) considered that they had spent 35 per cent of their time on trust-fund personnel, more or less in line with the 37 per cent indicated above (including GEF), the Finance Section staff assessed their use of time as being 47 per cent for trust funds, and the Fund Programme Management Branch considered they spent 49 per cent of their total time on trust funds.

12. Although these ex post facto assessments of time-use by individual staff members may be considered rather subjective, there are grounds for believing that the measurement of administrative costs may have understated the actual costs involved: whereas work on Environment Fund projects is basically standardized, each trust fund tends to have different requirements, including separate substantive and financial reporting. Project-management work for trust funds

also involves relatively more project revisions than other projects, since trust fund contributions are generally received during the course of the year to which they relate, which requires that projects are extended several times to reflect the timing of the receipt of additional resources.

## III. CONCLUSION

13. The above interim analysis was conducted in accordance with Council decision 18/44 B. Its findings broadly support the maintenance of the current level of the administrative support charge at 13 per cent, and also suggest that the Environment Fund resources do not unduly subsidize trust fund activities. However, several factors point to the likelihood that the real cost of administering trust-fund programmes may actually be higher than can be stated using the current methodology. It has not been feasible to accurately incorporate the costs of the input of the various programme managers and the Fund Programme Management Branch incurred by trust-fund programmes. Nor is it presently feasible to undertake a comprehensive time-management study of the workload undertaken by all staff for activities under each source of funding during the ongoing reorganization of administrative services following the creation of UNON means that operational procedures are being reviewed and changed, and thus current estimates of the administrative costs can not be fully accurate.

14. Nevertheless, the fact remains that, as a United Nations programme, UNEP is subject to the financial rules and regulations in force for the United Nations system as a whole, and the actual definition of the level of the administrative support charge remains the responsibility of the General Assembly. In this light, it may be recalled that the figure of 13 per cent was endorsed by the Assembly in sections II and V of its resolution 35/217 of 17 December 1980. In sum, therefore, even if the real level of administrative costs is clearly established as being above 13 per cent, the current level will remain applicable until it is amended by the General Assembly.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

# Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/19
11 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 4 (c) of the provisional agenda*

POLICY ISSUES: COORDINATION AND COOPERATION WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS, INCLUDING NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

## System-wide strategy in the field of the environment

## Note by the Executive Director

### Summary

The draft system-wide strategy in the field of the environment, which is presented to the Governing Council of UNEP at its nineteenth session in the form of an information paper UNEP/GC.19/INF.11 is intended to provide a first draft for the consideration of the Council and to elicit its views on the further development of a strategic system-wide approach to the environmental challenges that were identified by the Council at its eighteenth session, namely, the sustainable management and use of natural resources; sustainable production and consumption; a better environment for human health and well-being; globalization trends and the environment and the important area of environmental information and assessment. Programmatic thrusts developed in each programme area are designed to meet the broad environmental objectives identified in the draft strategy. The strategy should, with respect to the organization of the United Nations system, provide both a tool for coordination in the area of environment and a common basis for future system-wide policy and programme development. The strategy also attempts to identify emerging environmental issues and trends, and this attempt should evolve into a proactive approach designed to assist in the identification of a future programmatic focus.

### Suggested action by the Governing Council

* UNEP/GC.19/1.

Na.96-0862 141296

141296

/...

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

In view of the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly for the review of the implementation of Agenda 21 (June 1997), it is anticipated that there may be significant changes that would have to be reflected in the strategy. In addition, the further procedure of consulting the organizations of the United Nations system that will have to take place for the purpose of finalizing the strategy would also have to take that into account. Consequently, the document is presented to the Council as an information paper and the Governing Council may wish to endorse the general direction outlined in this note as well as the document, and to request its further development and refinement in consultation with all relevant organizations of the United Nations system following the conclusion of the special session of the General Assembly. The Governing Council may also wish to request the Executive Director of UNEP to update the document periodically in consultation with the organizations of the United Nations system and to ensure its availability to member countries and all concerned international organizations, utilizing, inter alia, modern communication methods, including electronic mail. The finalized version of the strategy could be formally endorsed by the Governing Council at its next session.

## I. BACKGROUND

1. Following its review of the mid-term evaluation of the system-wide medium-term environment programme (SWMTEP), the Governing Council of UNEP, at its last session, endorsed the assessment of the Executive Director that there was a need for a strategy document in the field of the environment and that a draft document should be submitted to the Council in 1997 to become operational in 1998 (Governing Council decision 18/13). This document would provide the Governing Council with an important tool to assist in the discharge of its responsibility to promote international cooperation in the field of the environment, to recommend policies to that end, and to provide policy guidance for the direction and coordination of environmental programmes in the United Nations system, as established by the General Assembly of the United Nations (resolution 2997 (XXVII)) and reaffirmed in Agenda 21 (chapter 38).

2. The UNEP Inter-Agency Environment Coordination Group (IAEG) discussed the outline of the strategy prepared by UNEP at its consecutive meetings and agreed that the document should be of a strategic rather than a planning nature and should ensure complementarity of action while avoiding duplication. Thus, the objective of the document is to determine the strategic joint goals which should be achieved by the system in the area of the environment. The current draft, however, takes a broad and inclusive approach to identifying major programmatic thrusts and will have to be subject to further refinement through consultations within the United Nations system before it can be considered to define an authoritative strategy.

3. In consultations undertaken with the organizations of the United Nations System, through IAEG, an aspect that was stressed was that the strategy, once finalized, could also provide a clear framework for future collaboration between UNEP and its partner organizations in the system. It was also stressed that the strategy should not be seen as a rigid structure, but should allow of regular updating and strengthening in the light of ongoing developments. In that respect, it could also be an informative and

useful "living" document that would retain its relevance over the medium term.

4. While the strategy adopts a very comprehensive approach as regards the environmental issues that are addressed, it is not intended to duplicate Agenda 21 in terms of the sustainable development approach. It is intended to be a means of building further on the provisions of Agenda 21 in their environmental dimension and to assist in the development of a strategic orientation and a coherent system-wide response to them and to other intergovernmental decisions and action plans, including those of the Governing Council of UNEP, the General Assembly, the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), the governing bodies of the specialized agencies and United Nations organizations and the outcomes of major conferences.

5. The United Nations system-wide strategy is intended to provide eventually a comprehensive system-wide response to the identified environmental challenges, while emphasizing the institutional and organizational arrangements already in place in various parts of the United Nations system. These would include, in particular, the existing structure of task managers established by the Inter-Agency Committee for Sustainable Development (IACSD), and subsequently endorsed by the CSD, as well as joint formal and informal collaborative arrangements that have been established in various programme areas. IACSD, as the standing subsidiary body of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), has established the system of task managers to take the lead in inter-agency coordination in the various programme areas of Agenda 21 and to fulfil requirements of reporting to CSD. Relevant task managers of the United Nations system are referred to in the draft strategy document in each programme area. UNEP has been designated as Task Manager in the following areas:

(a) Chapter 9 - Protection of the atmosphere - jointly with WMO;

(b) Chapter 12 - Combating desertification and drought;

(c) Chapter 15 - Biological diversity;

(d) Chapter 19 - Toxic chemicals;

(e) Chapter 20 - Hazardous waste; and

(f) Chapter 40 - UNEP is joint Task Manager as far as the system-wide Earthwatch is concerned, with the United Nations Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development.

6. The further development and refinement of the strategy will be undertaken through inter-agency consultations, and in particular, will take account of the outcome of the special session of the General Assembly in June 1997, which is expected to have implications for the future programmes of work of various United Nations organizations and entities and will thus have a direct bearing on the strategy itself. In addition, this further refinement could include prioritization of the programme thrusts, if so required by the Governing Council of UNEP. The deliberations of the Council

on policy matters will be taken into account, as well as the outcome of the special session of the General Assembly.

## II. STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

7. At its eighteenth session, the Governing Council of UNEP adopted the UNEP programme of work for the biennium 1996-1997. The following areas were identified as major environmental challenges:

(a) Sustainable management and use of natural resources;

(b) Sustainable production and consumption;

(c) A better environment for human health and well-being; and

(d) Globalization trends and the environment.

8. The document will inform future UNEP cooperation with the organizations of the United Nations system and, as agreed with partners in that system, is based on the identification of objectives and the programmatic thrusts required to meet them, while addressing the above-mentioned environmental challenges identified by the Governing Council of UNEP. In addition, a chapter on environmental information and assessment has been added, emphasizing the role of the United Nations system in that area.

9. Broad programmatic thrusts in each programme area, designed to meet the objectives identified and which require system-wide collaboration, are grouped under the following headings and correspond to the priority areas of action for UNEP identified in Agenda 21:

(a) Assessment (environmental monitoring dissemination of information and scientific research);

(b) Policy (promoting international cooperation; developing international law; promoting regional cooperation and raising public awareness); and

(c) Management (facilitating transfer of environmentally sound technologies and providing technical, legal and institutional advice to the various countries).

10. The strategy also aims at identifying emerging environmental issues and trends, which will gain importance in the near future thus calling for concerted international action.

### A. Sustainable management and use of natural resources

11. Rapid population growth, unsustainable patterns of production and consumption, the expansion of agriculture and uncontrolled urbanization have led to intensified and unsustainable pressures on land, water and biological and atmospheric resources. The pollution and mismanagement of natural resources, especially in the most vulnerable ecological areas, are eroding the ecosystems that uphold human life. Caring for natural resources and

promoting their sustainable use by the international community are essential to ensure the survival and the well-being of the Earth.

12. The sustainable management and use of natural resources are dealt with in the following chapters of Agenda 21: chapter 9 (Protection of the atmosphere), chapter 10 (Integrated approach to the planning and management of land resources), chapter 11 (Combating deforestation), chapter 12 (Managing fragile ecosystems: combating desertification and drought), chapter 13 (Managing fragile ecosystems: sustainable mountain development), chapter 14 (Promoting sustainable agriculture and rural development), chapter 15 (Conservation of biological diversity), chapter 16 (Environmentally sound management of biotechnology), chapter 17 (Protection of the oceans, all kinds of seas, including enclosed and semi-enclosed seas, and coastal areas and the protection, rational use and development of their living resources) and chapter 18 (Protection of the quality and supply of freshwater resources: application of integrated approaches to the development, management and use of water resources).

## B. Sustainable production and consumption patterns

13. Widespread and unsustainable patterns of consumption and production continue to degrade the global environment. The utilization of inappropriate technologies results in high waste yields, depletion of non-renewable resources and a wasteful use of energy. Unsustainable consumption patterns and lifestyles, particularly in the richest societies, combined with population growth place additional pressures on the carrying capacity of the Earth. Countries must attempt to establish an improved rationality in their consumption patterns and to move towards the adoption of cleaner production methods, utilizing low-waste and energy-efficient technologies.

14. Aspects of sustainable consumption and production patterns are identified in chapter 4 (Changing consumption patterns) of Agenda 21. Other chapters of Agenda 21, in particular chapter 9 (Protection of the atmosphere) and its programme area on energy development, are also of relevant in this respect.

## C. A better environment for human health and well-being

15. Rapid industrialization and urbanization result in the increasing prevalence of hazardous chemicals, toxic wastes and other pollutants in the environment, thus increasing the risks of water-borne and other diseases of environmental origin. Health-related risks have adverse effects on economic productivity and social welfare, including exacerbation of the adverse effects of natural disasters on the poor. The relationship between environmental degradation and pollution and human health and well-being must be better understood and preventive measures strengthened to mitigate negative environmental and social impacts.

16. The following chapters of Agenda 21 deal directly with this environmental challenge: chapter 5 (Demographic dynamics and sustainability), chapter 6 (Protecting the promoting human health), chapter 19 (Environmentally sound management of toxic chemicals, including the prevention of illegal international traffic in toxic and dangerous products), chapter 20 (Environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes,

including the prevention of illegal international traffic in hazardous wastes), chapter 21 (Environmentally sound management of solid wastes and sewage-related issues) and chapter 22 (Safe and environmentally sound management of radioactive wastes).

### D. Environmental information and assessment

17. The availability and quality of environmental data are indispensable for assessing global trends in the area of the environment and supporting policy recommendations and decision-making at all levels. Assessment and information must be based on scientifically reliable data, and strengthening the United Nations capacity to collect such information is of crucial importance. Early warning of emerging environmental risks would further enhance the capacity of the international community to take preventive action.

18. The relevant chapters of Agenda 21 are: chapter 2 (International cooperation to accelerate sustainable development in developing countries and related domestic policies), chapter 36 (Promoting education, public awareness and training) and chapter 39 (International legal instruments and mechanisms).

### E. Globalization trends and the environment

19. The globalization of the world economy, including the liberalization of trade, coupled with the absence and uneven application of norms and standards, have exacerbated burdens on the global environment. International and multidisciplinary approaches to understanding the relationship between trade and economic policies and the environment should underpin strategies to establish international and regional accords and policies to respond to global environmental challenges.

20. The relevant chapters of Agenda 21, namely chapter 2 on international cooperation and related domestic policies and chapter 39 on international legal instruments and mechanism, are of particular relevance to that challenge.

## III. CONCLUSION

21. The draft strategy document, presented to the Governing Council in the form of an information document (UNEP/GC.19.INF.11), constitutes the starting point for the development of a strategic approach outlining the broad objectives and actions to be taken by the United Nations system in the coming five years. It also indicates the involvement of specific United Nations organizations in the identified programme areas as well as the task managers designated by IACSD in those areas. It is intended that the strategy document will provide not only a general reference to what the United Nations system response to a given environmental challenge will be but also a common basis for future planning and programming in the field of the environment.

---

UNITED
NATIONS

EP

# Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/GC.19/20
5 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Nineteenth session
Nairobi, 27 January - 7 February 1997
Item 5 of the provisional agenda*

## PREPARATIONS FOR THE 1997 REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF AGENDA 21

## Estimates of costs for UNEP to implement fully those parts of Agenda 21 recommended for its attention

### Report of the Executive Director


### Summary

In its decisions 17/32 and 18/18, the Governing Council requested the Executive Director to present to the Council broad-based estimates of the costs for the Programme to fully implement those parts of Agenda 21 specifically recommended for its attention. Those parts are contained in chapter 38 of Agenda 21, listing priority areas on which UNEP should concentrate, and in other chapters in which UNEP is either referred to or in which the organization received specific directives. The present report presents broad-based estimates for each of the programme components as contained in the 1996-1997 programme of work.


### Suggested action by the Governing Council

The Governing Council may wish to:

1. Take note of the present report of the Executive Director on the estimates of costs for UNEP to fully implement those parts of Agenda 21 specifically recommended for its attention;

2. Recognize the gap between the present level of resources being provided to UNEP and the levels that would be required for UNEP to fully implement all elements of Agenda 21 that have been recommended for its attention by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED);

3. Urge Governments to ensure that the provision of adequate financial resources occurs on a timely basis in order to allow UNEP to fulfil its responsibilities under Agenda 21.

---

* UNEP/GC.19/1.


Na.96-0839 091296 101296


/...


For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

## Introduction

1. Agenda 21 requires that UNEP increase the scope and depth of its programme, taking into account the developmental aspects of environmental questions, reinforcing its catalytic and coordinating role and supporting Governments and development agencies and organs in the integration of environmental aspects into their development policies and programmes. In particular, chapter 38 of Agenda 21 stresses that UNEP should be enhanced and strengthened and should undertake new roles, for example, the provision of technical and policy advice to Governments on the integration of environmental aspects into development programmes. Agenda 21 also states, in its paragraph 38.23, that in order to perform its functions, UNEP would require access to greater expertise and provision of adequate financial resources.

2. Since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), the programmes of work of UNEP have been firmly guided by the expectations of Agenda 21, and they continue to be prepared taking into account the priorities assigned to UNEP by Agenda 21, as endorsed by General Assembly resolution 47/191 of 22 December 1992 and decision 17/32 of the Governing Council; the activities in support of international environmental conventions; UNEP's role in the Global Environment Facility (GEF); and the expressed needs of Governments. The programme of work is a technically integrated and regionally sensitive programme that addresses mandated priority areas where UNEP has a comparative advantage.

3. The present report is the secretariat's best attempt to provide Governments with an estimate of the cost to UNEP to implement Agenda 21 within its mandate and within its present organizational structure. Both the mandate and structure of UNEP are a direct result of a re-orientation and restructuring of the programme in alignment with the new directions and emphasis provided by UNCED and by the Governing Council at its seventeenth and eighteenth sessions.

## I. COSTING METHODOLOGY AND ESTIMATES

4. Since estimating the cost to implement broad tasks entrusted to an institution is essentially a scoping exercise, a methodology to set the limits was developed. For the purposes of this exercise, the secretariat observed a growth limit of individual programme elements of 50 per cent per biennium, and estimated resource requirements for the 1998-1999 and 2000-2001 bienniums, although several programmes estimated higher requirements. The $130 million programme of work for 1996-1997 was used as the base. In each programme, an estimate of the financial requirements to implement the Agenda 21 provisions have been made using fixed and estimated costs for additional activities such as the holding of meetings, the development of guidelines, the expansion of networks and so forth and for minimum additional staffing to implement an expanded programme. It should be noted that the estimates of costs neither include nor touch upon existing trust funds.

5. The table annexed to the present report is based on the methodology outlined in paragraph 4 above. For many programme areas, a reasonable level of implementation can be achieved by the 2000-2001 biennium. However, in a

number of important programme areas a doubling of the present budget is still far from sufficient to implement the Agenda 21 provisions. For example, adequate financing of international - and specifically UNEP - support to enable Earthwatch to carry out its mandated programmes would amount to roughly $53 million per biennium, a nearly sevenfold increase over the baseline budget. It is important to underscore that the estimates in the table below are based on the expectations of Agenda 21 and not on the realities of the present financial climate. For many programme areas, the UNCED secretariat made gross estimates based upon discussion and general principles relating to the scale of different sectors and order of magnitude estimates of the additional costs that might be incurred by Agenda 21 activities.

6. In reviewing the table, it is important to keep in mind two important considerations. First, as mentioned in paragraph 4 above, the programme elements are derived from the 1996-1997 programme of work. On the basis of these elements, a linkage to chapter 38 of Agenda 21 has been made. Chapter 38 was used since it identifies the priority areas on which UNEP was asked to concentrate its efforts. Specific activities requiring action by UNEP in keeping with the sectoral chapters of Agenda 21 are subsumed under the various subprogrammes and the general areas of concentration set out in chapter 38. Secondly, UNEP's capacity-building efforts in response to Agenda 21 are not identified as a separate programme. Activities have been rigorously limited to UNEP's leadership role in catalysing and mobilizing the capacity-building activities of other operational agencies and to enabling activities in programmes such as environmental law and assessment in which UNEP has a comparative advantage.

## II. CONCLUSION

7. UNCED recognized that additional financial resources would be required to strengthen the capacities of international institutions to implement their responsibilities under Agenda 21. Regrettably, however, the high expectations that UNCED raised for new and additional resources have not been realized. Instead of increased revenues, UNEP is witnessing shrinking resources. The broad-based estimates for UNEP to implement the Agenda 21 provisions are in stark contrast to the expected level of financing in the 1998-1999 biennium.

8. The speed, intensity and efficacy with which tasks entrusted to UNEP can be carried out is determined by a number of factors, including human and financial resources. There is a considerable disparity between the immense task of implementing Agenda 21 and UNEP's relatively small programme. Therefore, it is obvious that if UNEP is to fulfil the Agenda 21 mandate assigned to it, it will need to have access to substantial additional human and financial resources.

9. UNEP's programme has evolved since UNCED, and has become better focused and integrated in response to the needs of countries, institutions and people. In order to implement the most urgent priorities listed in Agenda 21, UNEP must receive resources on an assured and timely basis. Governments might wish to consider the cost estimate presented and address the discrepancy between the demands made upon the organization and the level and modality of its financing.

Annex

ESTIMATES OF COSTS TO IMPLEMENT THOSE PARTS OF AGENDA 21
RECOMMENDED FOR ITS ATTENTION

| Programme element | Link with Agenda 21 | 1996-1997 baseline (1) (US$) | 1998-1999 Cost estimate (US$) | 2000-2001 Cost estimate (US$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 Freshwater, coastal and marine resources | Ch.38.22 a,b,d,l | 19,500,000 | 23,625,000 | 35,437,000 |
| 1.2 Biological resources | Ch.38.22 a,b,d,h,k,m | 10,400,000 | 15,600,000 | 23,400,000 |
| 1.3 Land resources | Ch.38.22 a,d,h,m | 11,700,000 | 17,550,000 | 26,325,000 |
| 1.4 Information for decision-making and action planning (ENRIN) | Ch.38.22 a,f,k,l | 9,100,000 | 13,650,000 | 20,475,000 |
| 2.1 Sustainable production | Ch.38.22 a,d,h,k | 10,400,000 | 15,600,000 | 23,400,000 |
| 2.2.1 Energy policies and technologies | Ch.38.22 a,j | 1,733,000 | 2,600,000 | 3,900,000 |
| 2.2.2 Support to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change | Ch.38.22 a,h | 867,000 | 2,141,000 | 3,442,000 |
| 2.3.1 Sustainable consumption patterns | Ch.38.22 a,b | 1,300,000 | 1,950,000 | 2,925,000 |
| 3.1 Toxic chemicals and waste | Ch.38.22 a,h | 7,800,000 | 10,300,000 | 10,400,000 |
| 3.2.1 Urban environmental planning and management, development of sustainable cities and local Agenda 21 | Ch.38.22 a,m | 4,047,000 | 4,803,000 | 5,721,000 |
| 3.2.2 International Environmental Technology Centre (IETC) | Ch.38.22 a,j,l | 2,453,000 | 3,730,000 | 5,519,000 |
| 3.3.1 Develop response strategies for environmental threats, emergencies and non-judicial mechanisms for the avoidance and settlement of environmental disputes | Ch.38.22 a,n | 1,300,000 | 1,955,000 | 2,385,000 |

| Programme element | Link with Agenda 21 | 1996-1997 baseline (1) (US$) | 1998-1999 Cost estimate (US$) | 2000-2001 Cost estimate (US$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.1.1 Promoting the development of mutually supportive environmental trade and policies agreements | Ch.38.22 a,f | 1,300,000 | 3,650,000 | 5,460,000 |
| 4.2 Environmental economics | Ch.38.22 a,b,c,i,m | 1,300,000 | 2,145,000 | 3,217,000 |
| 4.3 Environmental law | Ch.38.22 a,h,l | 4,187,000 | 8,754,000 | 13,131,000 |
| 4.3.2 Coordination of international and regional conventions in the field of the environment | Ch.38.22 a,h | 192,000 | 340,000 | 364,000 |
| 4.3.3 Information Unit for Conventions (IUC) | Ch.38.22 a,h | 820,000 | 1,230,000 | 1,845,000 |
| 4.4.1 Promote targeted scientific research in critical environmental areas | Ch.38.22 a,e | 1,260,000 | 2,875,000 | 2,875,000 |
| 4.4.2 Regional workshops (2) | Ch.38.22 a,k | 169,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.4.3. Policy responses and inter-agency affairs (3) | Ch.38.22 a,e | 335,000 | 2,481,000 | 3,722,000 |
| 4.4.4 Gender | Ch.38.22 a,e | 419,000 | 750,000 | 938,000 |
| 4.4.5 Committee of International Development Institutions on Environment (CIDIE) | Ch.38.22 a,m | 419,000 | 628,000 | 691,000 |
| 5.1 Environmental assessment | Ch.38.22 a,d,f | 7,800,000 | 23,400,000 | 52,900,000 |
| 5.2.1 Regional Office for Africa | Ch.38.22 a,k,m | 2,600,000 | 2,600,000 | 3,042,000 |
| 5.2.2 Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific | Ch.38.22 a,k,m | 2,600,000 | 3,900,000 | 5,850,000 |
| 5.2.3 Regional Office for Europe | Ch.38.22 a,k,m | 1,950,000 | 2,925,000 | 4,387,000 |
| 5.2.4 Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean | Ch.38.22 a,k,m | 2,600,000 | 2,600,000 | 3,042,000 |
| 5.2.5 Regional Office for North America | Ch.38.22 a,k,m | 1,300,000 | 1,950,000 | 2,925,000 |

| Programme element | Link with Agenda 21 | 1996-1997 baseline (1) (US$) | 1998-1999 Cost estimate (US$) | 2000-2001 Cost estimate (US$) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.2.6 Regional Office for West Asia | Ch.38.22 a,k,m | 1,950,000 | 3,400,000 | 4,590,000 |
| 5.3.1 Education and training | Ch.38.22 a,g | 339,000 | 18,000,000 | 18,000,000 |
| 5.3.2 Major groups | Ch.38.22 a,g | 2,409,000 | 3,614,000 | 5,421,000 |
| 5.3.3 Public information and special events | Ch.38.22 a,g | 7,857,000 | 9,428,000 | 11,758,000 |
| 5.3.4 Public information services | Ch.38.22 a,g | 1,094,000 | 1,422,000 | 2,133,000 |
| 5.4.1 Design and implement a coordinated system for international environment information exchange. GRID | Ch.38.22 a,f,k | 2,328,000 | 3,492,000 | 5,238,000 |
| 5.4.1 Infoterra | Ch.38.22 a,f,k | 1,733,000 | 2,597,000 | 3,895,000 |
| 5.4.1 Electronic Information Services (EIS) | Ch.38.22 a,f,k | 2,439,000 | 2,559,000 | 2,765,000 |
| **TOTAL** | | 130,000,000 | 218,244,000 | 321,518,000 |

(1) The baseline is the **130 million** version of the 1996-1997 work programme.

(2) This programme element is deleted in the 1998-1999 work programme and is subsumed under other programme elements.

(3) Policy responses and inter-agency affairs are considered separate programmes, each with its own budget allocation, but were presented under the same programme element in the 1996-1997 work programme.

---